

ELGAR ENCYCLOPEDIAS IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Encyclopedia
— of —
CRITICAL
POLITICAL SCIENCE



Edited by
CLYDE W. BARROW



Encyclopedia of Critical Political Science

ELGAR ENCYCLOPEDIAS IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Elgar Encyclopedias in the Social Sciences serve as the definitive reference works to their fields. Each *Encyclopedia* is overseen by an editor internationally recognised as a leading name within the field, and contain a multitude of entries written by key scholars, providing an accessible and condensed overview of the key topics within a given subject area. Volumes in the series are commissioned across the breadth of the social sciences, and cover areas including, but not limited to, Political Science, Sociology, Human Geography, Development Studies, Social Policy, Public Management and Public Policy. Individual entries present a concise and logical overview of a given subject, together with a list of references for further study. Each *Encyclopedia* will serve as an invaluable resource for practitioners, academics, and students, and should form an essential part of any research journey.

For a full list of Edward Elgar published titles, including the titles in this series, visit our website at www.e-elgar.com.

Encyclopedia of Critical Political Science

Edited by

Clyde W. Barrow

*Professor of Political Science, The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley,
USA*

ELGAR ENCYCLOPEDIAS IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

 **Edward Elgar**
PUBLISHING

Cheltenham, UK • Northampton, MA, USA

© Clyde W. Barrow 2024

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical or photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior permission of the publisher.

Published by
Edward Elgar Publishing Limited
The Lypiatts
15 Lansdown Road
Cheltenham
Glos GL50 2JA
UK

Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc.
William Pratt House
9 Dewey Court
Northampton
Massachusetts 01060
USA

A catalogue record for this book
is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Control Number: 2023951988

This book is available electronically in the **Elgaronline**
Political Science and Public Policy subject collection
<http://dx.doi.org/10.4337/9781800375918>

ISBN 978 1 80037 590 1 (cased)
ISBN 978 1 80037 591 8 (eBook)

Contents

<i>Alphabetical list of entries</i>	xiii	10	Institutional Marxism	68
<i>List of editors, editorial advisors and contributors</i>	xxii		<i>Stephen Maher and Scott M. Aquanno</i>	
<i>Preface</i>	xlvi	11	Latino politics and Marxism	74
			<i>Gilberto Garcia and Rodolfo D. Torres</i>	
What is critical political science?	1	12	Open Marxism	82
<i>Clyde W. Barrow</i>			<i>Ana Cecilia Dinerstein, Frederick Harry Pitts, and Patrizia Zanoni</i>	
PART I THEORY, METHOD, AND CRITIQUE				
1 Critique of pluralism	19	13	Quantitative Marxism	88
<i>Clyde W. Barrow</i>			<i>John Paul Dunne</i>	
2 Power structure analysis	25	14	Structural Marxism	93
<i>Joseph G. Peschek</i>			<i>Geoffrey Pfeifer</i>	
3 Critique of positivism and the post-behavioral revolution	30	15	Structural-functional Marxism	98
<i>Josh Berkenpas</i>			<i>Rafael Khachaturian</i>	
4 Critical theory	35	16	Systems-analytic Marxism	103
<i>Bradley J. Macdonald</i>			<i>Clyde W. Barrow</i>	
5 Ideology critique	40	SECTION II: THEORIES OF THE STATE		
<i>Joshua Simon</i>		17	What is the state?	110
6 Disciplinary history	46		<i>Clyde W. Barrow</i>	
<i>Emily Hauptmann</i>		18	Marxist theories of the state I	112
SECTION I: MARXISM			<i>Rafael Khachaturian</i>	
7 Analytical Marxism	52	19	Marxist theories of the state II	120
<i>Roberto Veneziani</i>			<i>Clyde W. Barrow</i>	
8 Black Marxism	57	20	Transnational state	126
<i>Azaan W. Akbar</i>			<i>Joel Z. Garrod</i>	
9 Historical Marxism	62	21	Feminist theory and the state	131
<i>Bryan D. Palmer</i>			<i>Gillian Youngs</i>	

22	Theories of imperialism and empire <i>Emanuele Saccarelli and Latha Varadarajan</i>	136	39	Thorstein Veblen's critical social theory <i>Scott R. Bowman</i>	232
23	World-systems analysis <i>Gregory P. Williams</i>	141	40	Critical media studies <i>Brian L. Ott and Robert L. Mack</i>	237
24	Critical political economy <i>Angela Wigger</i>	146	41	Critical film studies <i>Michael Wayne</i>	242
25	Global studies <i>Amentahru Wahlrab</i>	152	42	Literary criticism I <i>David Anshen</i>	247
26	Critical border studies <i>Sandro Mezzadra and Brett Neilson</i>	157	43	Literary criticism II <i>Philip Goldstein</i>	253
27	Critical pedagogy <i>William W. Sokoloff</i>	162	44	Science fiction <i>George A. Gonzalez</i>	261
28	Critical university studies <i>Timothy V. Kaufman-Osborn</i>	167	45	Art <i>Mark Mattern</i>	266
29	Critique of intellectuals <i>Russell Jacoby</i>	172	46	Music <i>Nancy S. Love</i>	271
30	Critical legal studies <i>Paul J. Baumgardner</i>	178	PART II CRITICAL JOURNALS		
31	Feminist critiques of political science <i>Mary E. Hawkesworth</i>	183	47	Capitalism, nature, socialism <i>Salvatore Engel-Di Mauro</i>	278
32	Critical race theory <i>Adolphus Belk, Jr.</i>	191	48	<i>Critical Sociology</i> <i>David Fasenfest</i>	281
33	Latinx politics <i>Julio Orellana</i>	199	49	<i>democracy</i> <i>Olivier Rouchet</i>	285
34	Ecology and environmental theory <i>Timothy W. Luke</i>	205	50	<i>Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy</i> <i>Bonnie Mann and Brooke Burns</i>	288
35	Intersectionality <i>Jennifer Leigh Disney</i>	210	51	<i>International Feminist Journal of Politics</i> <i>Kathleen B. Jones and Gillian Youngs</i>	293
36	Social movements analysis <i>Anthony R. DiMaggio</i>	217	52	<i>Monthly Review</i> <i>Victor Wallis</i>	296
37	Autoethnography <i>Sanford F. Schram</i>	222	53	<i>New Political Science: a journal of politics & culture</i> <i>Clyde W. Barrow and Jocelyn M. Boryzcka</i>	299
38	Genealogy <i>Michael Lipscomb</i>	227			

54	<i>Review of Radical Political Economics</i> <i>Michael Keaney</i>	303	70	Communism <i>Jake Lin</i>	345
55	<i>Science & Society</i> <i>Leandros Savvides</i>	307	71	Community self-defense <i>scott crow</i>	347
56	<i>Signs: journal of women in culture and society</i> <i>Mary E. Hawkesworth</i>	309	72	Contradiction <i>Bryant William Sculos</i>	350
57	<i>Socialism and Democracy</i> <i>Victor Wallis</i>	313	73	Corporate liberalism <i>Scott R. Bowman</i>	352
58	<i>Socialist Register</i> <i>Greg Albo and Alan Zuege</i>	317	74	Corporate power <i>Stan Luger</i>	354
59	<i>Socialist revolution/review</i> <i>Michael Scipioni</i>	320	75	Council communism <i>Marcel Marius van der Linden</i>	356
60	<i>Strategies: A Journal of Theory, Culture, and Politics</i> <i>Bradley J. Macdonald</i>	321	SECTION I: CRISES OF CAPITALISM		
61	<i>Studies in Political Economy: A Socialist Review</i> <i>Rianne Mahon and Donald Swartz</i>	323	76	Economic crisis <i>Mindy Peden</i>	359
PART III CONCEPTS			77	Fiscal crisis <i>Mindy Peden</i>	361
62	Academic repression <i>Clyde W. Barrow</i>	328	78	Legitimation crisis <i>Mindy Peden</i>	362
63	Alienation <i>Ruth Porter Groff</i>	330	79	Motivation crisis <i>Clyde W. Barrow</i>	364
64	Anarchism <i>Todd May</i>	333	80	Rationality crisis <i>Clyde W. Barrow</i>	366
65	Antifascism <i>Stanislav Vysotsky</i>	335	81	Cultural imperialism <i>Stacy Maddern</i>	369
66	Capitalist class <i>Kevin Funk</i>	337	SECTION II: DEBT		
67	Class <i>Berch Berberoglu</i>	339	82	Private debt <i>G. Andrew Gonzalez</i>	372
68	Colonialism <i>Asma Abbas</i>	341	83	Public debt <i>Daniel Bin</i>	374
69	Commodity fetishism <i>Julie E. Dowsett</i>	343	84	Student debt <i>Robert E. Kirsch</i>	377
			SECTION III: DEMOCRACY		
			85	Deliberative democracy <i>Stephanie Burkhalter</i>	380

86	Digital democracy <i>Petros Iosifidis</i>	383	104	Immigration <i>Carla Angulo-Pasel</i>	421
87	Economic democracy <i>Mark Kaswan</i>	385	105	Indigenous movements <i>Michael Lerma</i>	423
88	Participatory democracy <i>Clement Fatovic</i>	387	106	Inequality <i>Tom Malleon</i>	425
89	Populist democracy <i>Tracy L. R. Lightcap</i>	389	107	Internal colonialism <i>Pedro Gonsalves de Alcântara Formiga</i>	429
90	Radical democracy <i>Michael Scipioni</i>	391	108	Investment theory of party competition <i>Joseph G. Peschek</i>	431
91	Dependency theory <i>James Parisot</i>	393	109	Lumpenproletariat <i>Clyde W. Barrow</i>	433
92	Direct action <i>Billie Murray</i>	395	110	Marriage equality <i>Claire Snyder-Hall</i>	435
93	Diversity of tactics <i>Benjamin Abrams</i>	397	111	Mass strike <i>Peter Hudis</i>	437
94	Domination <i>William Clare Roberts</i>	400	112	Migration <i>Carla Angulo-Pasel</i>	439
95	Dual power <i>Mark D. Steinberg</i>	402	113	Mode of production <i>Joel Z. Garrod</i>	441
96	Environmental justice <i>David N. Pellow</i>	404	114	Mutual aid <i>scott crow</i>	444
97	Ethnicity <i>Natasha Altema-McNeely</i>	406	115	Nation and nationalism <i>Berch Berberoglu</i>	446
98	Exploitation <i>Mark D. Wood</i>	408	116	Neo-colonialism <i>Michael Keaney</i>	448
99	Financialization <i>Michael Keaney</i>	410	117	Objectification <i>Willow Verkerk</i>	450
100	Gender <i>Katie Temple</i>	412	118	Petit bourgeoisie <i>Katherine E. Young</i>	452
101	General strike <i>Robert Ovetz</i>	414	119	Policy-planning organizations <i>Joseph G. Peschek</i>	454
102	Hegemony <i>Massimo Modonesi</i>	416	120	Postcolonialism <i>Michael Keaney</i>	456
103	Ideology <i>Nancy S. Love</i>	418			

121	Post-Marxism <i>Clyde W. Barrow</i>	458	138	Baran, Paul <i>Dean Snyder</i>	498
122	Postmodernism <i>Stephen R.C. Hicks</i>	460	139	Barber, Benjamin <i>Clement Fatovic</i>	500
123	Poststructuralism <i>Sarah Marie Wiebe</i>	462	140	Barrow, Clyde W. <i>William L. Niemi</i>	502
124	Poverty <i>Stephen Pimpare</i>	464	141	Bay, Christian <i>Hamideh Sedghi</i>	504
125	Proletariat <i>Dave Beech</i>	466	142	Berg, John <i>William F. Grover</i>	507
126	Racialization <i>Christopher Kyriakides and Beatrice Anane-Bediakoh</i>	469	143	Block, Fred <i>Mathieu Charbonneau</i>	509
127	Reification <i>Mary E. Wiltacil</i>	471	144	Boggs, Carl <i>Carl Boggs</i>	511
128	Ruling class <i>Jokubas Salyga</i>	474	145	Bookchin, Murray <i>Maddy Koch</i>	514
129	Socialism <i>Bryant William Sculos</i>	477	146	Bronner, Stephen Eric <i>Manfred B. Steger</i>	516
130	Surplus value <i>Dean Snyder</i>	480	147	Carver, Terrell <i>Bradley J. Macdonald</i>	518
131	Syndicalism <i>Stacy Maddern</i>	482	148	Castells, Manuel <i>Melisa Ross</i>	520
132	Vanguard <i>Alan Shandro</i>	484	149	Chomsky, Noam <i>Joseph G. Peschek</i>	522
PART IV PEOPLE			150	Cleaver, Harry <i>Robert Ovetz</i>	524
133	Althusser, Louis <i>Isaac Kamola</i>	487	151	Cloward, Richard A. <i>Michael Anthony Lewis</i>	527
134	Amin, Samir <i>Prabhat Patnaik</i>	489	152	Connolly, William E. <i>Bradley J. Macdonald</i>	529
135	Anderson, Perry <i>Gregory P. Williams</i>	491	153	Davis, Angela Y. <i>Bryant William Sculos</i>	531
136	Aronowitz, Stanley <i>Jason Kosnoski</i>	493	154	Debord, Guy <i>Gabriele Schimmenti</i>	534
137	Ashcraft, Richard E. <i>William L. Niemi and Clyde W. Barrow</i>	495	155	Deleuze, Gilles <i>Andrew Johnson</i>	535

156	Domhoff, G. William <i>Joseph G. Peschek</i>	537	174	Guattari, Félix <i>C.L. Welker</i>	574
157	Du Bois, W.E.B. <i>Lucien Ferguson</i>	539	175	Habermas, Jürgen <i>Nancy S. Love</i>	576
158	Ehrenberg, John <i>John Ehrenberg</i>	541	176	Hall, Stuart <i>Andrew Johnson</i>	578
159	Eisenstein, Zillah <i>Olga Patricia Velásquez Ocampo</i>	543	177	Harrington, Michael <i>Peter Dreier</i>	580
160	Enloe, Cynthia <i>Vanessa Gauthier Vela</i>	545	178	Hartsock, Nancy C.M. <i>Augusta Nannerini</i>	583
161	Frantz, Fanon <i>Irene Gendzier</i>	547	179	Harvey, David <i>Dean Snyder</i>	585
162	Federici, Silvia <i>Jeta Mulaj</i>	549	180	Hawkesworth, Mary <i>Jennifer Leigh Disney</i>	587
163	Ferguson, Kathy E. <i>Sofía Pérez Gil</i>	551	181	hooks, bell <i>Olivia Atkinson</i>	590
164	Foucault, Michel <i>Clement Fatovic</i>	553	182	Jacoby, Russell <i>Joseph G. Peschek</i>	592
165	Fraser, Nancy <i>Jason Kosnoski</i>	555	183	Jameson, Fredric <i>Jelle Versieren</i>	595
166	Freire, Paulo <i>Melisa Ross</i>	557	184	Jessop, Bob <i>Umut Özsü</i>	597
167	Galbraith, John Kenneth <i>Michael Keaney</i>	559	185	Katsiaficas, George <i>Victor Wallis</i>	600
168	Garvey, Marcus <i>Stacy Maddern</i>	561	186	Kesselman, Mark <i>Kenton Worcester</i>	602
169	Gindin, Sam <i>Greg Albo and Alan Zuege</i>	563	187	Kolko, Gabriel <i>Eli Cook</i>	604
170	Gorz, André <i>Paolo Murrone</i>	566	188	Laclau, Ernesto <i>Melisa Ross</i>	606
171	Gouldner, Alvin <i>James J. Chriss</i>	568	189	Lefebvre, Henri <i>Alex Farrington</i>	608
172	Grant, Judith <i>Judith Grant</i>	570	190	Love, Nancy S. <i>Chad Lavin</i>	610
173	Green, Philip <i>Laura Green</i>	572	191	Luke, Timothy W. <i>Sarah M. Surak</i>	612

192	Lustig, R. Jeffrey <i>Mark B. Brown</i>	614	210	Panitch, Leo V. <i>Greg Albo and Alan Zuege</i>	653
193	Lyotard, Jean-François <i>Kiff Bamford</i>	616	211	Parenti, Michael <i>Dusten R. Pettengill</i>	656
194	Macdonald, Bradley J. <i>Clyde W. Barrow</i>	618	212	Pateman, Carole <i>Mark Kaswan</i>	658
195	MacKinnon, Catharine A. <i>Julie E. Dowsett</i>	620	213	Peschek, Joseph G. <i>William F. Grover</i>	660
196	Macpherson, C.B. <i>Phillip Hansen</i>	622	214	Petchesky, Rosalind <i>Manal A. Jamal</i>	662
197	Magdoff, Harry <i>Stacy Maddern</i>	624	215	Peterson, V. Spike <i>Meredith Reid Sarkees</i>	664
198	Marcuse, Herbert <i>Robert E. Kirsch</i>	626	216	Petras, James <i>Henry Veltmeyer</i>	667
199	McConnell, Grant <i>G. William Domhoff</i>	629	217	Piven, Frances Fox <i>Margaret Groarke</i>	669
200	McCoy, Charles A. <i>Clyde W. Barrow</i>	632	218	Polanyi, Karl <i>David J. Plante</i>	671
201	Miliband, Ralph <i>William F. Grover</i>	634	219	Poulantzas, Nicos <i>Jacinta Gorriti</i>	673
202	Mills, C. Wright <i>A. Javier Treviño</i>	636	220	Reed, Jr., Adolph L. <i>Daniel T. Kirsch</i>	675
203	Mills, Charles W. <i>Taylor Rogers</i>	638	221	Reinaga, Fausto <i>Ximena Cordova</i>	677
204	Mouffe, Chantal <i>Melisa Ross</i>	640	222	Rensenbrink, John <i>Clyde W. Barrow</i>	679
205	Newton, Huey P. <i>Omari L. Dyson</i>	642	223	Robinson, Cedric J. <i>William L. Niemi</i>	681
206	Nkrumah, Kwame <i>Jeffrey S. Ahlman</i>	644	224	Robinson, William I. <i>Michael Keaney</i>	682
207	O'Connor, James <i>Michael Keaney</i>	646	225	Roelofs, H. Mark <i>Clyde W. Barrow</i>	684
208	Ollman, Bertell <i>Clyde W. Barrow</i>	648	226	Roelofs, Joan <i>Joan Roelofs</i>	686
209	Olson, Laura Katz <i>Michael Stein</i>	651	227	Sarkees, Meredith Reid <i>Nancy E. McGlen</i>	688

228	Schram, Sanford <i>Roni Strier and Guy Feldman</i>	690	239	Wallerstein, Immanuel <i>Gregory P. Williams</i>	713
229	Sedghi, Hamideh <i>Sofia Pérez Gil</i>	692	240	Wallis, Victor <i>Chris Agee</i>	716
230	Singer, J. David <i>Meredith Reid Sarkees</i>	694	241	West, Cornel <i>Mark D. Wood</i>	718
231	Skinner, Quentin <i>Kari Palonen</i>	696	242	Williams, Raymond <i>Joseph G. Peschek</i>	720
232	Snyder-Hall, Claire <i>Claire Snyder-Hall</i>	698	243	Williams, William Appleman <i>James Parisot</i>	722
233	Steger, Manfred <i>Isaac Kamola</i>	700	244	Wolin, Sheldon <i>Olivier Rouchet</i>	724
234	Surkin, Marvin <i>Marvin Surkin</i>	702	245	Wright, Erik Olin <i>Göran Therborn</i>	726
235	Sweezy, Paul M. <i>Ludo Cuyvers</i>	704	246	Young, Iris Marion <i>Juliana Santos de Carvalho</i>	728
236	Therborn, Göran <i>Jelle Versieren</i>	707	247	Zeitlin, Maurice <i>Victor Wallis</i>	730
237	Torres, Rodolfo D. <i>Christopher Kyriakides</i>	709	248	Zinn, Howard <i>Alix L. Olson</i>	732
238	Ture, Kwame <i>Beatrice Anane-Bediakoh</i>	711		<i>Index</i>	735

Alphabetical list of entries

Entry	Author	Part/Section	Page
Academic repression	Clyde W. Barrow	Part III Concepts	328
Alienation	Ruth Porter Groff	Part III Concepts	330
Althusser, Louis	Isaac Kamola	Part IV People	487
Amin, Samir	Prabhat Patnaik	Part IV People	489
Analytical Marxism	Roberto Veneziani	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	52
Anarchism	Todd May	Part III Concepts	333
Anderson, Perry	Gregory P. Williams	Part IV People	491
Antifascism	Stanislav Vysotsky	Part III Concepts	335
Aronowitz, Stanley	Jason Kosnoski	Part IV People	493
Art	Mark Mattern	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	266
Ashcraft, Richard E.	William L. Niemi and Clyde W. Barrow	Part IV People	495
Autoethnography	Sanford F. Schram	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	222
Baran, Paul	Dean Snyder	Part IV People	498
Barber, Benjamin	Clement Fatovic	Part IV People	500
Barrow, Clyde W.	William L. Niemi	Part IV People	502
Bay, Christian	Hamideh Sedghi	Part IV People	504
Berg, John	William F. Grover	Part IV People	507
Black Marxism	Azaan W. Akbar	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	57
Block, Fred	Mathieu Charbonneau	Part IV People	509
Boggs, Carl	Carl Boggs	Part IV People	511
Bookchin, Murray	Maddy Koch	Part IV People	514
Bronner, Stephen Eric	Manfred B. Steger	Part IV People	516
Capitalism, nature, socialism	Salvatore Engel-Di Mauro	Part II Critical Journals	278
Capitalist class	Kevin Funk	Part III Concepts	337
Carver, Terrell	Bradley J. Macdonald	Part IV People	518
Castells, Manuel	Melisa Ross	Part IV People	520
Chomsky, Noam	Joseph G. Peschek	Part IV People	522
Class	Berch Berberoglu	Part III Concept	339
Cleaver, Harry	Robert Ovetz	Part IV People	524

Entry	Author	Part/Section	Page
Cloward, Richard A.	Michael Anthony Lewis	Part IV People	527
Colonialism	Asma Abbas	Part III Concepts	341
Commodity fetishism	Julie E. Dowsett	Part III Concepts	343
Communism	Jake Lin	Part III Concepts	345
Community self-defense	scott crow	Part III Concepts	347
Connolly, William E.	Bradley J. Macdonald	Part IV People	529
Contradiction	Bryant William Sculos	Part III Concepts	350
Corporate liberalism	Scott R. Bowman	Part III Concepts	352
Corporate power	Stan Luger	Part III Concepts	354
Council communism	Marcel Marius van der Linden	Part III Concepts	356
Critical border studies	Sandro Mezzadra and Brett Neilson	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	157
Critical film studies	Michael Wayne	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	242
Critical legal studies	Paul J. Baumgardner	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	178
Critical media studies	Brian L. Ott and Robert L. Mack	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	237
Critical pedagogy	William W. Sokoloff	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	162
Critical political economy	Angela Wigger	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	146
Critical race theory	Adolphus Belk, Jr.	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	191
<i>Critical Sociology</i>	David Fasenfest	Part II Critical Journals	281
Critical theory	Bradley J. Macdonald	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	35
Critical university studies	Timothy V. Kaufman-Osborn	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	167
Critique of intellectuals	Russell Jacoby	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	172
Critique of pluralism	Clyde W. Barrow	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	19
Critique of positivism and the post-behavioral revolution	Josh Berkenpas	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	30

Entry	Author	Part/Section	Page
Cultural imperialism	Stacy Maddern	Part III Concepts	369
Davis, Angela Y.	Bryant William Sculos	Part IV People	531
Debord, Guy	Gabriele Schimmenti	Part IV People	534
Deleuze, Gilles	Andrew Johnson	Part IV People	535
Deliberative democracy	Stephanie Burkhalter	Part III Concepts	380
<i>democracy</i>	Olivier Rouchet	Part II Critical Journals	285
Dependency theory	James Parisot	Part III Concepts	393
Digital democracy	Petros Iosifidis	Part III Concepts	383
Direct action	Billie Murray	Part III Concepts	395
Disciplinary history	Emily Hauptmann	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	46
Diversity of tactics	Benjamin Abrams	Part III Concepts	397
Domhoff, G. William	Joseph G. Peschek	Part IV People	537
Domination	William Clare Roberts	Part III Concepts	400
Dual power	Mark D. Steinberg	Part III Concepts	402
Du Bois, W.E.B.	Lucien Ferguson	Part IV People	539
Ecology and environmental theory	Timothy W. Luke	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	205
Economic crisis	Mindy Peden	Part III Concepts	359
Economic democracy	Mark Kaswan	Part III Concepts	385
Ehrenberg, John	John Ehrenberg	Part IV People	541
Eisenstein, Zillah	Olga Patricia Velásquez Ocampo	Part IV People	543
Enloe, Cynthia	Vanessa Gauthier Vela	Part IV People	545
Environmental Justice	David N. Pellow	Part III Concepts	404
Ethnicity	Natasha Altema-McNeely	Part III Concepts	406
Exploitation	Mark D. Wood	Part III Concepts	408
Federici, Silvia	Jeta Mulaj	Part IV People	549
Ferguson, Kathy E.	Sofía Pérez Gil	Part IV People	551
Feminist critiques of political science	Mary E. Hawkesworth	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	183
Feminist theory and the state	Gillian Youngs	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	131
Financialization	Michael Keaney	Part III Concepts	410
Fiscal crisis	Mindy Peden	Part III Concepts	361
Foucault, Michel	Clement Fatovic	Part IV People	553
Frantz, Fanon	Irene Gendzier	Part IV People	547
Fraser, Nancy	Jason Kosnoski	Part IV People	555

Entry	Author	Part/Section	Page
Freire, Paulo	Melisa Ross	Part IV People	557
Galbraith, John Kenneth	Michael Keaney	Part IV People	559
Garvey, Marcus	Stacy Maddern	Part IV People	561
Gindin, Sam	Greg Albo and Alan Zuege	Part IV People	563
Gender	Katie Temple	Part III Concepts	412
Genealogy	Michael Lipscomb	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	227
General strike	Robert Ovetz	Part III Concepts	414
Global studies	Amentahru Wahlrab	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	152
Gorz, André	Paolo Murrone	Part IV People	566
Gouldner, Alvin	James J. Chriss	Part IV People	568
Grant, Judith	Judith Grant	Part IV People	570
Green, Philip	Laura Green	Part IV People	572
Guattari, Félix	C.L. Welker	Part IV People	574
Habermas, Jürgen	Nancy S. Love	Part IV People	576
Hall, Stuart	Andrew Johnson	Part IV People	578
Harrington, Michael	Peter Dreier	Part IV People	580
Hartsock, Nancy C. M.	Augusta Nannerini	Part IV People	583
Harvey, David	Dean Snyder	Part IV People	585
Hawkesworth, Mary	Jennifer Leigh Disney	Part IV People	587
Hegemony	Massimo Modenesi	Part III Concepts	416
Historical Marxism	Bryan D. Palmer	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	62
hooks, bell	Olivia Atkinson	Part IV People	590
<i>Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy</i>	Bonnie Mann and Brooke Burns	Part II Critical Journals	288
Ideology	Nancy S. Love	Part III Concepts	418
Ideology critique	Joshua Simon	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	40
Immigration	Carla Angulo-Pasel	Part III Concepts	421
Indigenous movements	Michael Lerma	Part III Concepts	423
Inequality	Tom Malleson	Part III Concepts	425
Institutional Marxism	Stephen Maher and Scott M. Aquanno	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	68
Internal colonialism	Pedro Gonsalves de Alcântara Formiga	Part III Concepts	429
<i>International Feminist Journal of Politics</i>	Kathleen B. Jones and Gillian Youngs	Part II Critical Journals	293

Entry	Author	Part/Section	Page
Intersectionality	Jennifer Leigh Disney	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	210
Investment theory of party competition	Joseph G. Peschek	Part III Concepts	431
Jacoby, Russell	Joseph G. Peschek	Part IV People	592
Jameson, Fredric	Jelle Versieren	Part IV People	595
Jessop, Bob	Umut Özsü	Part IV People	597
Katsiaficas, George	Victor Wallis	Part IV People	600
Kesselman, Mark	Kenton Worcester	Part IV People	602
Kolko, Gabriel	Eli Cook	Part IV People	604
Laclau, Ernesto	Melisa Ross	Part IV People	606
Latinx politics	Julio Orellana	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	199
Latino politics and Marxism	Gilberto Garcia and Rodolfo D. Torres	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	74
Lefebvre, Henri	Alex Farrington	Part IV People	608
Legitimation crisis	Mindy Peden	Part III Concepts	362
Literary criticism I	David Anshen	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	253
Literary criticism II	Philip Goldstein	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	247
Love, Nancy S.	Chad Lavin	Part IV People	610
Luke, Timothy W.	Sarah M. Surak	Part IV People	612
Lumpenproletariat	Clyde W. Barrow	Part III Concepts	433
Lustig, R. Jeffrey	Mark B. Brown	Part IV People	614
Lyotard, Jean-François	Kiff Bamford	Part IV People	616
Macdonald, Bradley J.	Clyde W. Barrow	Part IV People	618
MacKinnon, Catharine A.	Julie E. Dowsett	Part IV People	620
Macpherson, C.B.	Phillip Hansen	Part IV People	622
Magdoff, Harry	Stacy Maddern	Part IV People	624
Marcuse, Herbert	Robert E. Kirsch	Part IV People	626
Marriage equality	Claire Snyder-Hall	Part III Concepts	435
Marxist theories of the state I	Rafael Khachaturian	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	112
Marxist theories of the state II	Clyde W. Barrow	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	120
Mass strike	Peter Hudis	Part III Concepts	437
McConnell, Grant	G. William Domhoff	Part IV People	629
McCoy, Charles A.	Clyde W. Barrow	Part IV People	632
Migration	Carla Angulo-Pasel	Part III Concepts	439

Entry	Author	Part/Section	Page
Miliband, Ralph	William F. Grover	Part IV People	634
Mills, C. Wright	A. Javier Treviño	Part IV People	636
Mills, Charles W.	Taylor Rogers	Part IV People	638
<i>Monthly Review</i>	Victor Wallis	Part II Critical Journals	296
Mode of production	Joel Z. Garrod	Part III Concepts	441
Motivation crisis	Clyde W. Barrow	Part III Concepts	364
Mouffe, Chantal	Melisa Ross	Part IV People	640
Music	Nancy S. Love	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	271
Mutual aid	scott crow	Part III Concepts	444
Nation and nationalism	Berch Berberoglu	Part III Concepts	446
Neo-colonialism	Michael Keaney	Part III Concepts	448
<i>New Political Science: a journal of politics & culture</i>	Clyde W. Barrow and Jocelyn M. Boryzcka	Part II Critical Journals	299
Newton, Huey P.	Omari L. Dyson	Part IV People	642
Nkrumah, Kwame	Jeffrey S. Ahlman	Part IV People	644
Objectification	Willow Verkerk	Part III Concepts	450
O'Connor, James	Michael Keaney	Part IV People	646
Ollman, Bertell	Clyde W. Barrow	Part IV People	648
Olson, Laura Katz	Michael Stein	Part IV People	651
Open Marxism	Ana Cecilia Dinerstein, Frederick Harry Pitts and Patrizia Zanoni	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	82
Panitch, Leo V.	Greg Albo and Alan Zuege	Part IV People	653
Parenti, Michael	Dusten R. Pettengill	Part IV People	656
Participatory democracy	Clement Fatovic	Part III Concepts	387
Pateman, Carole	Mark Kaswan	Part IV People	658
Peschek, Joseph G.	William F. Grover	Part IV People	660
Petchesky, Rosalind	Manal A. Jamal	Part IV People	662
Peterson, V. Spike	Meredith Reid Sarkees	Part IV People	664
Petite bourgeoisie	Katherine E. Young	Part III Concepts	452
Petras, James	Henry Veltmeyer	Part IV People	667
Piven, Frances Fox	Margaret Groarke	Part IV People	669
Polanyi, Karl	David J. Plante	Part IV People	671
Policy-planning organizations	Joseph G. Peschek	Part III Concepts	454

Entry	Author	Part/Section	Page
Populist democracy	Tracy L. R. Lightcap	Part III Concepts	389
Postcolonialism	Michael Keaney	Part III Concepts	456
Post-Marxism	Clyde W. Barrow	Part III Concepts	458
Postmodernism	Stephen R.C. Hicks	Part III Concepts	460
Poststructuralism	Sarah Marie Wiebe	Part III Concepts	462
Poulantzas, Nicos	Jacinta Gorriti	Part IV People	673
Poverty	Stephen Pimpare	Part III Concepts	464
Power structure analysis	Joseph G. Peschek	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	25
Private debt	G. Andrew Gonzalez	Part III Concepts	372
Proletariat	Dave Beech	Part III Concepts	466
Public debt	Daniel Bin	Part III Concepts	374
Quantitative Marxism	John Paul Dunne	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	88
Racialization	Christopher Kyriakides and Beatrice Anane-Bediakoh	Part III Concepts	469
Radical democracy	Michael Scipioni	Part III Concepts	391
Rationality crisis	Clyde W. Barrow	Part III Concepts	366
Reed, Jr, Adolph L.	Daniel T. Kirsch	Part IV People	675
Reification	Mary E. Witlacil	Part III Concepts	471
Reinaga, Fausto	Ximena Cordova	Part IV People	677
Rensenbrink, John	Clyde W. Barrow	Part IV People	679
<i>Review of Radical Political Economics</i>	Michael Keaney	Part II Critical Journals	303
Robinson, Cedric J.	William L. Niemi	Part IV People	681
Robinson, William I.	Michael Keaney	Part IV People	682
Roelofs, H. Mark	Clyde W. Barrow	Part IV People	684
Roelofs, Joan	Joan Roelofs	Part IV People	686
Ruling class	Jokubas Salyga	Part III Concepts	474
Sarkees, Meredith Reid	Nancy E. McGlen	Part IV People	688
Schram, Sanford	Roni Strier and Guy Feldman	Part IV People	690
<i>Science & Society</i>	Leandros Savvides	Part II Critical Journals	307
Science fiction	George A. Gonzalez	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	261
Sedghi, Hamideh	Sofia Pérez Gil	Part IV People	692
<i>Signs: journal of women in culture and society</i>	Mary E. Hawkesworth	Part II Critical Journals	309

Entry	Author	Part/Section	Page
Singer, J. David	Meredith Reid Sarkees	Part IV People	694
Skinner, Quentin	Kari Palonen	Part IV People	696
Snyder-Hall, Claire	Claire Snyder-Hall	Part IV People	698
Social movements analysis	Anthony R. DiMaggio	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	217
Socialism	Bryant William Sculos	Part III Concepts	477
<i>Socialism and Democracy</i>	Victor Wallis	Part II Critical Journals	313
<i>Socialist Register</i>	Greg Albo and Alan Zuege	Part II Critical Journals	317
<i>Socialist revolution/ review</i>	Michael Scipioni	Part II Critical Journals	320
Steger, Manfred	Isaac Kamola	Part IV People	700
<i>Strategies: A Journal of Theory, Culture, and Politics</i>	Bradley J. Macdonald	Part II Critical Journals	320
Structural Marxism	Geoffrey Pfeifer	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	93
Structural-functional Marxism	Rafael Khachaturian	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	98
Student debt	Robert E. Kirsch	Part III Concepts	377
<i>Studies in Political Economy: A Socialist Review</i>	Rianne Mahon and Donald Swartz	Part II Critical Journals	323
Surkin, Marvin	Marvin Surkin	Part IV People	702
Surplus value	Dean Snyder	Part III Concepts	480
Sweezy, Paul M.	Ludo Cuyvers	Part IV People	704
Syndicalism	Stacy Maddern	Part III Concepts	482
Systems-analytic Marxism	Clyde W. Barrow	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	103
Theories of imperialism and empire	Emanuele Saccarelli and Latha Varadarajan	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	136
Therborn, Göran	Jelle Versieren	Part IV People	707
Thorstein Veblen's critical social theory	Scott R. Bowman	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	232
Torres, Rodolfo D.	Christopher Kyriakides	Part IV People	709
Ture, Kwame	Beatrice Anane-Bediakoh	Part IV People	644
Transnational state	Joel Z. Garrod	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	126

Entry	Author	Part/Section	Page
Vanguard	Alan Shandro	Part III Concepts	484
Wallerstein, Immanuel	Gregory P. Williams	Part IV People	713
Wallis, Victor	Chris Agee	Part IV People	716
West, Cornel	Mark D. Wood	Part IV People	718
What is critical political science?	Clyde W. Barrow	Introduction	1
What is the state?	Clyde W. Barrow	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	110
Williams, Raymond	Joseph G. Peschek	Part IV People	720
Williams, William Appleman	James Parisot	Part IV People	722
Wolin, Sheldon	Olivier Rouchet	Part IV People	724
World-systems analysis	Gregory P. Williams	Part I Theory, Method, and Critique	141
Wright, Erik Olin	Göran Therborn	Part IV People	726
Young, Iris Marion	Juliana Santos de Carvalho	Part IV People	728
Zeitlin, Maurice	Victor Wallis	Part IV People	730
Zinn, Howard	Alix L. Olson	Part IV People	732

Editors, editorial advisors and contributors

Editor

Clyde W. Barrow (Ph.D., Political Science, University of California, Los Angeles, 1984) is Professor of Political Science at The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley. He is the former Chair (2009–13) and Treasurer (2015–20) of the Caucus for a Critical Political Science. He is a former Associate Editor of *New Political Science* and a member of the journal's Editorial Board (2011–present). He is the 2022 recipient of the Charles A. McCoy Career Achievement Award. His most recent books are *Toward a Critical Theory of States: The Poulantzas-Miliband Debate After Globalization* (SUNY Press, 2016) and *The Dangerous Class: The Concept of the Lumpenproletariat* (University of Michigan Press, 2020).

Editorial Advisors

Jennifer Leigh Disney (Ph.D., Political Science, The Graduate School & University Center of The City University of New York, 2002) is Professor & Chair of the Department of Political Science and Director of the Women's & Gender Studies Program at Winthrop University. She has written a book on *Women's Activism and Feminist Agency in Mozambique and Nicaragua* and has published articles in *New Political Science*, *Socialism & Democracy*, *Social Justice*, and *Women & Politics*. She has also served as Co-Editor of *New Political Science: A Journal of Politics & Culture* and Co-Chair of the Caucus for a Critical Political Science.

Gilberto Garcia (Ph.D., Political Science, University of California, Riverside, 1986) is an Associate Professor of Political Science and affiliate of the Center for Latino and Latin American Studies at Central Washington University. He is co-editor *Repensar la filosofía de la praxis: Homenaje a Adolfo Sánchez Vásquez* (Re-thinking the Philosophy of Praxis: A Tribute to Adolfo Sánchez Vásquez, 2017) with Ambrosio Velasco and Víctor

Manuel Hernández Márquez and other publications on Latinas/os in the United States.

Nancy S. Love (Ph.D., Government, Cornell University, 1984) is Professor of Political Science at Appalachian State University. She is the former Co-Editor of *New Political Science: A Journal of Politics and Culture* (2008–14) and former Chair of the Caucus for a Critical Political Science (2017–23). In 2022, she received the Donald W. Sink Family Outstanding Scholar Award from the College of Arts & Sciences at Appalachian State University. She edits the book series, Critical Thinking and Contemporary Politics, De Gruyter Publishers. Her recent books are *Trendy Fascism: White Power Music and the Future of Democracy* (SUNY 2016) and *Doing Democracy: Activist Art and Cultural Politics*, co-edited with Mark Mattern (SUNY 2013).

Bradley J. Macdonald (Ph.D., Political Science, University of California, Los Angeles, 1991) is Professor in the Department of Political Science at Colorado State University where he teaches Political Theory. He was Chair of the Caucus for a Critical Political Science from 2013 to 2017, and is currently Book Series Editor for the "New Political Science" series at SUNY Press. He is the author of books and articles that explore issues related to Critical Theory, Western Marxism, and cultural politics, including *William Morris and the Aesthetic Constitution of Politics* (Lexington Books, 1999) and *Performing Marx: Contemporary Negotiations of a Living Tradition* (SUNY Press, 2006).

William L. Niemi (Ph. D., Political Science, University of California, Los Angeles, 1987) is Professor of Politics and Government at Western Colorado University. He is former Chair of Behavioral and Social Sciences (2007–2011), Associate V.P. for Academic Affairs (2011–13), and V.P. for Academic Affairs (2013–22). His articles include, with David J. Plante, "Antecedents of Resistance,"

New Political Science (2008); with David J. Plante, “Democratic Movements, Self-Education, and Economic Democracy,” *Radical History Review* (2008); with David J. Plante, “The Great Recession, Liberalism, and the Meaning of the New Deal,” *New Political Science* (2011); and “Karl Marx’s Sociological Theory of Democracy,” *Social Science Journal* (2011); “Should Progressives Fight or Welcome the Republican Effort to Call a Constitutional Convention?,” *New Political Science* (2023).

Joseph G. Peschek (Ph.D., Political Science, University of Massachusetts-Amherst, 1984) is Professor Emeritus of Political Science at Hamline University in St. Paul, Minnesota. He is the former Editor (2002–08) of the journal *New Political Science*. He is the author of *Policy-Planning Organizations: Elite Agendas and America’s Rightward Turn* (1987) and the co-author (with William F. Grover) of *The Unsustainable Presidency: Clinton, Bush, Obama and Beyond* (2014). He is the co-editor (with William F. Grover) of *Voices of Dissent: Critical Readings in American Politics* (nine editions, 1993–2013).

William W. Sokoloff (Ph.D., Political Science, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 2002) is Professor of Political Science at The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley. He is former Treasurer (2020–21) of the Caucus for a Critical Political Science. He is currently Associate Editor of the journal *New Political Science: A Journal of Politics and Culture*. His books include *Political Science Pedagogy: A Critical, Radical and Utopian Perspective* (Palgrave, 2020) and *Confrontational Citizenship: Reflections on Hatred, Rage, Revolution and Revolt* (SUNY Press, 2017). He is co-editor (with Nicholas Kiersey) of *Tactics and Emancipation in the Age of Authoritarian Neoliberalism* (Routledge, 2023).

Rodolfo D. Torres (Ph.D., Administration, Planning and Social Policy, Claremont Graduate School, 1983) is Professor Emeritus of Urban Planning and Latina and Latino Studies at the University of California, Irvine. Torres is author and editor of numerous books and articles on class politics, Marxist political economy, and the “race” problematic, including *The Latino Question* (2018) with Armando Ibarra and Alfredo Carlos and *Savage State: Welfare Capitalism and Inequality* (2004) with Edward J Martin.

Contributors

Asma Abbas (Ph.D., Political Science, Pennsylvania State University, 2005) is Professor of Politics and Philosophy at Bard College at Simon’s Rock, United States; the Dean of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences at Al Akhawayn University, Morocco; and graduate faculty at the Indus Valley School of Art and Architecture, Pakistan. She is the author of *Liberalism and Human Suffering: Materialist Reflections on Politics, Ethics, and Aesthetics* (2010) and *Another Love: A Politics of the Unrequited* (2018). She recently curated *Falsework, Smalltalk: Political Education, Aesthetic Archives, Recitations of a Future in Common* (2021) and *Anticolonial Maps for Lost Lovers* (2023).

Benjamin Abrams (Ph.D., Political Sociology, University of Cambridge, 2017) is Lecturer in Sociology at University College London (UCL). He holds a Leverhulme Trust Fellowship in Politics and Sociology at UCL. He is Chief Editor of *Contention: The Multidisciplinary Journal of Social Protest* (2013–present, with Giovanni A. Travaglino), and a member of the Editorial Board of *Sociology*. His most recent books are *The Rise of the Masses: Spontaneous Mobilization and Contentious Politics* (University of Chicago Press, 2023) and (with Peter R. Gardner), *Symbolic Objects in Contentious Politics* (University of Michigan Press, 2023).

Chris Agee (M.A., Sociology, New School for Social Research, 2003) is an Adjunct Professor in the greater New York metropolitan area. He teaches a variety of courses in sociology and political science. He is the editor and publisher of *Covert Action Magazine*.

Jeffrey S. Ahlman (Ph.D., University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, 2011) is an Associate Professor of History and Chair of African Studies at Smith College. He has published two books on Nkrumah-era Ghana: *Living with Nkrumahism: Nation, State, and Pan-Africanism in Ghana* (Ohio University Press, 2017) and *Kwame Nkrumah: Visions of Liberation* (Ohio University Press, 2021). He recently authored *Ghana: A Social and Political History* (Zed Books, 2024).

Azaan W. Akbar (MSc, International Social & Public Policy, London School of Economics and Political Science, 2021) is a Secondary School Teacher of Humanities in London,

England. He was a Research Assistant for the Decolonising the Curriculum project (2021) at LSE. His most recent publications include “What Would a Marxist Evaluation of the Haitian Revolution Look Like?” in the *British Journal of Undergraduate Philosophy* (2016), “Schools Now Have the Perfect Opportunity to #DecoloniseTheCurriculum” (LSE Social Policy blog, 2020), and “The Epistemic Urgency of Decolonised Curriculums” in the *Journal of Philosophy of Education* (forthcoming).

Greg Albo (Ph.D., Political Science, Carleton University, 1994) is a Professor of Politics at York University, Toronto. He is co-editor of the annual *Socialist Register* and is on the editorial Boards of *Studies in Political Economy*, and *Historical Materialism*. He serves as chair of the Centre for Social Justice in Toronto. His recent edited books include: *Capital and Politics* (Monthly Review Press, 2022), *State Transformations: Classes, Strategy, Socialism* (Brill, 2021), *New Polarizations, Old Contradictions: The Crisis of Centrism* (Monthly Review, 2021), *Divided Province: Ontario Politics in the Age of Neoliberalism* (McGill-Queens’s University Press, 2019).

Natasha Altema-McNeely (Ph.D., Political Science, University of Iowa, 2013) is an Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Texas Rio Grande Valley. Her research focuses on race, ethnicity, and gender in political institutions, political behavior, voting, and campaigns & elections, as well as racial health disparities, specifically Black Maternal Mortality.

Beatrice Anane-Bediakoh (M.Ed., Humanities, Social Science and Social Justice Education, University of Toronto, 2015) is a Ph.D. Candidate in Sociology at York University. She is a former Chief Deputy Editor (2021–2023), Senior Peer Reviewer (2019–present) of *New Sociology: Journal of Critical Praxis*. She has a forthcoming chapter on “The Wall and the Border: The Project of Black Expulsion” in H. Randell-Moon and C. Banks, eds., *Space, Race, Bodies* (Manchester University Press, forthcoming 2025).

Carla Angulo-Pasel (Ph.D., Global Governance, Wilfrid Laurier University, 2018) is an Assistant Professor of Political Science at The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley. She is an executive board member of the Association for Borderlands Studies and was recently awarded a National

Science Foundation grant entitled *Migration and (In)Security at the U.S.-Mexican Border*. Her most recent publications in academic journals include “Border Vigilante/Militia Activity, the National Security State, and the Migrant ‘Threat’,” *Critical Studies on Terrorism* (2023) and “Rethinking the Space of the Migrant Shelter in Mexico: Humanitarian and Security Implications in the Practices of Bordering,” *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* (2022).

David Anshen (Ph.D. Comparative Literature, State University of New York at Stony Brook, 2004) is an Associate Professor of Literature(s) and Cultural Studies, University of Texas Rio Grande Valley. He has written and analysed William Faulkner, Norman Mailer, Jim Thompson, and other writers from a Marxist framework. He has more recently written about Movies, Television, Cultural Studies, and Cultural Theory. His recent book, titled *Marxist Literary and Cultural Theory*, explicates for beginners the basics of Marxism and its relationship to Culture with a treatment of the history of Marxist Literary Theory from Marx to Žizek.

Scott M. Aquanno (Ph.D., Political Science, York University, 2011) is an Assistant Professor of Political Science in the Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities at Ontario Tech University, and co-founder of City Idea Lab Oshawa. He previously held a Visiting Fellowship at the Munk School of Global Affairs and Public Policy and worked for a major US financial services firm. His latest book is *The Crisis of Risk: Subprime Debt and US Financial Power from 1944 to Present* (Edward Elgar, 2021).

Olivia Atkinson (Ph.D. Candidate, Political Science, University of Oregon) is a full-time faculty member at Seattle Central College. She has a Master of Arts in Women’s Studies from The University of Alabama (2018). She is a member of the Southeastern Women’s Studies Association. Her most recent publications include a book review of Jodi Dean’s *Comrade: An Essay on Political Belonging* and a reflection of Dr. Raka Ray’s, “The Politics of Masculinity in the Absence of Work,” published in UO’s The Center for the Study of Women in Society’s Annual Review.

Kiff Bamford (Ph.D., Art History and Visual Studies, University of Manchester, 2011) is Professor of Art & Philosophy at the Leeds

School of Arts, Leeds Beckett University, U.K. He is author of *Lyotard and the 'figural' in Performance, Art and Writing* (Continuum, 2012) and *Jean-François Lyotard: Critical Lives* (Reaktion Books, 2017), editor of *Jean-François Lyotard: The Interviews and Debates* (Bloomsbury, 2020), co-editor with Margret Grebowicz of *Lyotard and Critical Practice* (Bloomsbury, 2023) and co-editor with Robert Harvey of *Readings in Infancy* (Bloomsbury, 2023), the first complete English translation of Lyotard's *Lectures d'enfance*.

Paul J. Baumgardner (Joint Ph.D., Political Science and Interdisciplinary Humanities, Princeton University, 2020) is an assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at Augustana College. He is the author of *Critical Legal Studies and the Campaign for American Law Schools: A Revolution to Break the Liberal Consensus* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2021) and a co-author of *Keywords: For Further Consideration and Particularly Relevant to Academic Life* (Princeton University Press, 2018).

Dave Beech is a Reader at the University of the Arts London. He is an artist and writer who was a member of the Free Art Collective. His works have been exhibited at the Istanbul Biennale and Liverpool Biennale. He researches the formative social conditions for artistic practice and its relations to broader social and political forces. His most recent books are *Art and Labour* (Brill, 2020) and *Art and Post-Capitalism* (Pluto, 2019).

Adolphus Belk, Jr. (Ph.D., Government and Politics, University of Maryland, 2003) is Professor of Political Science and African American Studies at Winthrop University. His research interests include African American politics, race and ethnic politics, crime and mass imprisonment, social welfare policy, and Hip-Hop. Finally, Belk and Dr. Lakeyta Bonnette-Bailey are the editors of *For the Culture: Hip-Hop and the Fight for Social Justice* (University of Michigan Press, 2022).

Berch Berberoglu (Ph.D., Sociology, University of Oregon, 1977) is Foundation Professor of Sociology Emeritus at the University of Nevada, Reno. He is a former member of the Editorial Board of *The Insurgent Sociologist* (now *Critical Sociology*) and a recipient of the Lifetime Achievement Award of the Marxist Section

of the American Sociological Association in 2012. His most recent books are *America After Empire: The Vision for a New America in the 21st Century* (Routledge, 2023), *The Global Rise of Authoritarianism in the 21st Century* (Routledge, 2020); *The Palgrave Handbook of Social Movements, Revolution, and Social Transformation* (Palgrave, 2019); *Political Sociology in a Global Era* (Routledge, 2013); and *Class and Class Conflict in the Age of Globalization* (Lexington, 2009).

Josh Berkenpas (Ph.D., Political Science, Western Michigan University, 2016) is an associate professor of political science at Minnesota State University, Mankato. He is author of the article "'The Behavioral Revolution?' A Genealogy of a Concept" (*European Political Science*, 2016).

Daniel Bin (Ph.D., Sociology, Universidade de Brasília, 2010) is an associate professor of social sciences at the Universidade de Brasília, Brazil. He is a former visiting scholar at Yale University and at the University of Wisconsin–Madison. He is the author of the book *The Politics of Public Debt: Financialization, Class, and Democracy in Neoliberal Brazil* (Brill, 2020).

Carl Boggs (Ph.D., University of California, Berkeley, 1970) is a Marxist political scientist and sociologist, who has taught at Washington University, University of California Irvine, University of California Los Angeles, University of Southern California, Carleton University, Antioch University. He retired after teaching at National University in Los Angeles, although he remains active as a writer and speaker. Boggs was one of the first scholars to introduce the work of Antonio Gramsci to a U.S. audience. He has written extensively on U.S. militarism and its popular manifestation in Hollywood movies. He has also written numerous books and articles on ecological politics and the global ecological crisis. His work has appeared in *Theory and Society*, *New Politics*, *Telos*, *CounterPunch*, *New Political Science* and many other scholarly and popular outlets.

Jocelyn M. Boryzcka (Ph.D., Political Science, The Graduate Center, The City University of New York, 2004) is Dean of the College of Liberal Arts & Education and Professor of Political Science at the University of Detroit Mercy. She served as Editor, Co-Editor, and Associate Editor for the journal *New Political Science* from 2011–20, and has been a member of the jour-

nal's editorial board since 2020. She served as Secretary for the New Political Science Section (2011–14). Her recent scholarship works at the dynamic intersection of globalization and sex.

Scott R. Bowman (Ph.D., Political Science, University of California, Los Angeles, 1989) is Emeritus Professor of Political Science at California State University, Los Angeles. He is the author of *The Modern Corporation and American Political Thought: Law, Power, and Ideology* (Penn State Press, 1996) and numerous essays on diverse subjects, including media mergers and democracy, transnational corporate power, and American political thought during the Progressive Era.

Mark B. Brown (Ph.D., Political Science, Rutgers University, 2001), is Professor of Political Science at California State University, Sacramento. His publications include *Science in Democracy: Expertise, Institutions, and Representation* (MIT Press, 2009) and “James Baldwin and the Politics of White Identity,” *Contemporary Political Theory* 20 (2021): 1–22.

Stephanie Burkhalter (Ph.D., Political Science, University of Washington, 2007) is a Professor in the Department of Politics at California State Polytechnic University Humboldt. Her areas of scholarly interest are democratic theory, democratic deliberation, political communication and Congress. Her current research is focused on democratic deliberative processes, collaborative governance, and building civic skills in the college classroom.

Brooke Burns (B.A., Philosophy, Wesleyan University, 2018) is a doctoral candidate in philosophy at the University of Oregon and has served as an editorial assistant for *Hypatia* (2020–22). Her dissertation is a “politically realist genealogy” of dignity appeals in prisons and zoos.

Mathieu Charbonneau (Ph.D., Sociology, Carleton University and Sorbonne Université, Ottawa and Paris, 2017) is a Postdoctoral Fellow at the Karl Polanyi Institute of Political Economy, Concordia University and Part-time Professor at *École d'Innovation Sociale* of Université Saint-Paul. He is a Research Affiliate and former Postdoctoral Fellow at the Canadian Medication Appropriateness and Deprescribing Network, and an Associate Researcher at *Institut de recherche et d'informations socio-économiques*. His latest

publication is a co-authored chapter titled “The Contradictory Roles of the Insurance Industry in the Era of Climate Change,” in *Criminology and Climate: Insurance, Finance and the Regulation of Harmscapes* (Routledge, 2021).

James J. Chriss (Ph.D., Sociology, University of Pennsylvania, 1994) is Professor of Sociology at Cleveland State University. His most recent books are *Social Control: An Introduction*, 3rd edn (Polity, 2022) and *Law and Society: A Sociological Approach* (Sage, 2020). He is currently working on a book on Talcott Parsons for Routledge Press to be published in 2024.

Eli Cook (Ph.D., Harvard University, 2013) is an Associate Professor of History at the University of Haifa. He specializes in the history of American capitalism. His first book, *The Pricing of Progress: Economic Indicators and the Capitalization of American Life*, won the Society for U.S. Intellectual History's Best Book Award as well as the Morris D. Forkosch Best Book Prize from the *Journal of the History of Ideas*. He is currently working on a new book on the history of choice architects and the analog origins of digital capitalism for Penguin-Random House.

Ximena Cordova (Ph.D., Latin American History & Cultural Studies, Newcastle University, 2012) is Assistant Professor and Chair of Social Science in College of Humanities and Social Sciences at Zayed University in Abu Dhabi. She teaches socio-cultural anthropology, history, and area studies. Ximena specializes in digital anthropologies and her research focuses on how indigeneity intersects with performance practices, race, and the nation-making process in Bolivia. Her most recent publications analyse indigenous identity politics and performative participation at the intersection between race and “long” and “short” Bolivian political histories.

scott crow (North Garland High School dropout, 1985) has founded numerous anarchist cooperatives and social-political organizations including Emergency Hearts Media (2017), Common Ground Collective (2005), Treasure City Thrift (2007), Red Square (1995) and Century Modern (1997). He is the author of *Black Flags and Windmills* (2015), *Setting Sights: Histories and Reflection on Community Armed Self Defense* (2017) and *Emergency Hearts, Molotov Dreams* (2015).

scott is a featured subject in the books David Naguib Pellow, *Total Liberation: The Power and Promise of Animal Rights & the Radical Earth Movement* (2014), Ivan Greenberg, *Surveillance in America: Critical Analysis of the FBI* (2012) and Jimmy Dunson, *Building Power While the Lights Are Out: Disasters* (2022).

Ludo Cuyvers (Ph.D., Applied Economics, University of Antwerp, 1977) is Emeritus Professor at the University of Antwerp, Belgium, and Extraordinary Professor at the North-West University, Potchefstroom, South Africa. He has published in international journals, including the *European Economic Review*, *Economica*, *Economic Journal*, *Journal of Post-Keynesian Economics*, *Journal of Asian Economics*, *Review of Radical Political Economics*, *Science & Society*, and many others. He has also edited three books with international publishers. His most recent books are *The Economic Ideas of Marx's Capital – Steps Towards Post-Keynesian Economics* (Routledge, 2017) and *Neo-Marxism and Post-Keynesian Economics – From Kalecki to Sraffa and Joan Robinson* (Routledge, 2022).

Juliana Santos de Carvalho (LL.M., Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 2018) is a Ph.D. candidate in International Law with a minor in International Relations/Political Science at the Geneva Graduate Institute. Her most recent publications include reflections on the possibilities of silence for diversity and inclusion in international criminal law-making (“The Powers of Silence: Making Sense of the Non-Definition of Gender in International Criminal Law”), and a co-authored critical analysis of works proposing descriptive representation based on identity for solving the diversity deficit in international courts and tribunals (“Problematizing Diversity: The Change that International Lawyers (Do Not) Want for International Courts”).

Anthony R. DiMaggio (Ph.D., University of Illinois, Chicago) is Professor of Political Science at Lehigh University. He is the author of more than a dozen books focusing on social movements, communication, inequality, and U.S. politics. In the last few decades, he has contributed to numerous progressive media venues, including Salon, Counterpunch, Alternet, Common Dreams, and ZNet, and participated in various social movements involving labor, environmental, anti-war, anti-racist and anti-sexist activism.

Ana Cecilia Dinerstein (Ph.D., Sociology, University of Warwick, Coventry, 2002) is Professor of Political Sociology and Critical Theory at the University of Bath, UK. Her research on “the art of organizing hope,” which creates synergies contemporary prefigurative struggles and Ernst Bloch’s philosophy of hope, has been mobilized within academic, artist, and activist communities. She is founder of the Bath Centre for Decolonizing Knowledge and a member of the network Global Tapestry of Alternatives. She is author of *The Politics of Autonomy in Latin America: The Art of Organising Hope* (Palgrave, 2015). Her more recent books include *Open Marxism 4: Against a Closing World* (co-editor and author, Pluto Press, 2019) and *A World Beyond Work? Labour, Money, and the Capitalist State: Between Crisis and Utopia* (Emerald 2021, with Harry Pitts).

G. William Domhoff (Ph.D., Psychology, University of Miami, 1962) is a Distinguished Professor Emeritus and Research Professor at the University of California, Santa Cruz. He is most recently the author of *The Corporate Rich and the Power Elite in the Twentieth Century: How They Won, Why Liberals and Labor Lost* (Routledge, 2020) and *Who Rules America? The Corporate Rich, White Nationalist Republicans, and Inclusionary Democrats* (Routledge, 2022). His 13 other books on power include *Class and Power in the New Deal* (Stanford, 2011, with Michael J. Webber) and *Diversity in the Power Elite* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2018), with Richard Zweigenhaft.

Julie E. Dowsett (Ph.D., Political Science, York University, 2014) is Contract Faculty in the School of Gender, Sexuality and Women’s Studies and the Department of Social Science at York University in Toronto. She is a member of the Caucus for a Critical Political Science (American Political Science Association). Her research concerns the relationship between gender, politics, and consumerism. She has published in *Atlantis: Critical Studies in Gender, Culture & Social Justice*/Études critiques sur le genre, la culture, et la justice sociale, *Affinities: A Journal of Radical Theory, Culture, and Action*, the *International Journal of Feminist Politics*, and *Socialist Studies*/Études socialistes.

Peter Dreier (Ph.D., University of Chicago) is E.P. Clapp Distinguished Professor of Politics at Occidental College. Dreier joined

Occidental College in 1993 after serving as senior policy advisor to Boston Mayor Ray Flynn. Dreier writes widely on American politics and public policy, specializing in urban politics and policy, national politics, housing policy, community development, and community organizing. Dreier is co-author of seven books, including *The Next Los Angeles: The Struggle for a Livable City* (2005); *The 100 Greatest Americans of the 20th Century: A Social Justice Hall of Fame* (2012); *Place Matters: Metropolitcs for the 21st Century* (3rd edition, 2014); and *We Own the Future: Democratic Socialism, American Style* (2020).

John Paul Dunne (Ph.D., University of Edinburgh) is Emeritus Professor of Economics at the University of Cape Town and Emeritus Professor of Economics at University of the West of England, Bristol. He has held positions at Middlesex University, University of Leeds, University of Cambridge, University of Warwick, and Birkbeck College, University of London. He is co-editor of the online *Economics of Peace and Security Journal*. He has published widely on economics and security, including quantitative Marxism.

Omari L. Dyson (Ph.D., Curriculum & Instruction, Purdue University, 2008) is an Academic Professional (A.P.) Assistant Professor in the Department of Kinesiology at the University of North Carolina-Greensboro (UNCG). He is the former Book Review Editor for *Spectrum: A Journal on Black Men* (2017–22) and former Film & Media Review Editor for the *Journal of African American Studies* (2017–22). He is the lead editor for *African American Culture: An Encyclopedia of People, Traditions, and Customs* (ABC-CLIO Publishing, 2020) and author of *The Black Panther Party and Transformative Pedagogy: Place-Based Education in Philadelphia* (Lexington Books, 2014).

John Ehrenberg (Ph.D., Stanford University, 1965) is Senior Professor Emeritus of Political Science at Long Island University. He is the former Chair of the Political Science Department (1994–2009), Chair (1991–93) and Program Chair (1995–96) of the Caucus for a Critical Political Science and President of the Faculty Senate of Long Island University's Brooklyn Campus (2002–12). He has served on the Editorial Board of *New Political Science* (2009–present) and has authored several books, including *Civil*

Society: The Critical History of an Idea (NYU Press, 1999 and 2017) and *White Nationalism and the Republican Party: Toward Minority Rule in America* (Routledge, 2022).

Salvatore Engel-Di Mauro (Ph.D., Geography, Rutgers University, 2000) is Chair and Professor of the Geography Department at the State University of New York New Paltz. He is chief editor of the journal *Capitalism Nature Socialism* and an editorial board member of *Human Geography: A New Journal and Studies in Social Justice*. His most recent books are *State Socialism and Environment* (Pluto Press, 2021) and, with George Martin, *Urban Agriculture's Limits: The Case for Ecosocialist Urban Food Production* (Routledge, 2021).

Alex Farrington (Ph.D., Political Science, University of Oregon, 2022) is a Hatfield Resident Fellow at Portland State University. He recently published an article on Lefebvre's spatial politics in *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space* entitled "Reorienting *The Production of Space*: Rhythmanalysis, Desire, and the Siege of the Third Precinct in Minneapolis."

David Fasenfest (Ph.D. Sociology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1984) is an Associate Professor of Sociology at Wayne State University. He is the editor of *Critical Sociology* and the series *Studies in Critical Social Science and New Scholarship in Political Economy*. His most recent publications are "Constructing the Conceptual Tools for the Global South" in Håkon Leiulfstrud and Peter Sohlberg, eds. *Constructing the Research Object in Social Science* (Brill 2020) and "Emergency Management in Michigan: A Misguided Policy Initiative" in Ashley Nickels and Jason Rivera, eds., *Community Development and Public Administration Theory: Empowerment through the Enhancement of Democratic Principles* (Routledge 2020).

Clement Fatovic (Ph.D., Government, Cornell University, 2002) is Professor of Politics and International Relations at Florida International University (FIU). Fatovic is a member of the FIU Advisory Board of the journal *Class, Race, and Corporate Power*. His publications include *America's Founding and the Struggle over Economic Inequality* (University Press of Kansas, 2015) and *Interpretation in Political Theory* (co-edited with Sean Noah Walsh; Routledge, 2016).

Guy Feldman (Ph.D.) is an Assistant Professor in the Bob Shapell School of Social Work at Tel Aviv University. His research investigates how the problem of poverty is managed and governed in the face of a changing economic, political, and institutional environment, while exploring the opportunities for achieving meaningful social change in this transformed environment. His work has appeared in the *British Journal of Social Work*, *Social Policy & Administration*, *Journal of Social Policy*, and other academic journals. His most recent article is entitled “You Have the Right to Remain Silent: How Social Work Academics Cope with the Neoliberal University.”

Lucien Ferguson (Ph.D., Political Science, J.D., Northwestern University, Chicago and Evanston, 2023) is a Drinan Visiting Assistant Professor at Boston College Law School. His most recent publications include “From Love to Care: Arendt’s *Amor Mundi* in the Ethical Turn,” in *Political Theory*, and “Herbert Marcuse’s Legacy for Abolitionist Politics,” in *The Marcusean Mind* (Routledge).

Kevin Funk (Ph.D., Political Science, University of Florida, 2016) is a Fellow in the Committee on Global Thought at Columbia University, where he is also a Lecturer in the Department of Political Science and an affiliated faculty member of the Institute of Latin American Studies. He is a Senior Researcher with Security in Context, currently serves on the Governing Council of the International Studies Association-Northeast, and formerly was a member of the Executive Committee of the International Studies Association’s Global South Caucus. He is the author of *Rooted Globalism: Arab-Latin American Business Elites and the Politics of Global Imaginaries* (Indiana University Press, 2022).

Joel Z. Garrod (Ph.D., Sociology, Carleton University, Ottawa, 2019) is an Assistant Professor in Sociology at St. Francis Xavier University. His most recent publications are, “On the Property of Blockchains: Comments on an Emerging Literature” and “Imperialism or Global Capitalism? Some Reflections from Canada.”

Irene Gendzier (Ph.D., Political Science, Columbia University, 1964) is a Research Affiliate at the Harvard University Center for Middle East Studies and Professor Emeritus in the Department of Political Science at Boston University. She is currently working on a manuscript tentatively entitled, “Does

Knowing Matter.” Her recent books include *Development Against Democracy* (Pluto Press, 2017) and *Dying to Forget: Oil, Power, Palestine, and the Foundation of U.S. Policy in the Middle East* (Columbia University Press, 2015).

Sofia Pérez Gil (Ph.D. Candidate, Political and International Studies, Del Rosario University, Bogotá, Colombia of California) is a Ph.D. candidate and Assistant Professor of Research Methods for Political Science and International Relations at Del Rosario University. She is also a Commissioning Editor for *E-International Relations* (2023–present), and an active member of the Feminist Theories and Gender Studies Section at the International Studies Association (2022–present).

Philip Goldstein (Ph.D., English, Temple University) is Professor Emeritus of English at the University of Delaware. With James Machor, he edited *New Directions in Reception Study* (Oxford University Press, 2008) and *Reception Study: From Literary Theory to Cultural Studies* (Routledge, 2001). His most recent book is *The Theory and Practice of Reception Study: Reading Race and Gender in Twain, Faulkner, Ellison, and Morrison* (Routledge 2022).

Pedro Gonsalves de Alcântara Formiga (M.Sc., Law, University of São Paulo, Ribeirão Preto, 2021) is a Researcher at the Study and Research Group in Sociology of Law and Social and Environmental Rights of the University of São Paulo (2019–present). He is a Researcher at the Research Group on History of International Relations of the University of Lisbon School of Law (2021–present). His most recent works are *EXT 1362 in the STF: Prescription of Crimes against Humanity, the Extradition Process in Brazil and Jus Cogens* (Revista Inclusiones, 2021) and *Qualitative Research: The Chicago School Contribution* (Revista Cocar, 2021).

G. Andrew Gonzalez (Ph.D., Political Science, University of Tennessee, 2021) is an Assistant Professor and the Director of Political Science at Lincoln Memorial University. His main research interests include economic adversity, political behavior, and electoral behavior. His current works include two working papers, one on the impact of COVID-19 on the 2020 U.S. Presidential Election, and another on the effect of economic adversity in voter choice in recent American elections.

George A. Gonzalez (Ph.D., University of Southern California, 1997) is Professor of Political Science at the University of Miami (FL). Among his books are: *The Absolute and Star Trek* (2017, Palgrave MacMillan); *Star Trek and the Politics of Globalism* (Palgrave MacMillan, 2018); and *Popular Culture as Art and Knowledge* (Lexington, 2019). His most recent book is *Star Trek and Star Wars: The Enlightenment versus the Anti-Enlightenment* (Peter Lang, 2022). Through the vehicle of the popular culture, Prof. Gonzalez comments on metaphysics; international relations; justice; pragmatism; ethics; and the American left.

Jacinta Gorriti (B.A., Philosophy, Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Argentina, 2017) is a Ph.D. student in Latin American Social Studies (DESAL, Centro de Estudios Avanzados, Universidad Nacional de Córdoba) and Ph.D. Scholar of the Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios sobre Cultura y Sociedad (CONICET – UNC). She is a member of the research program “Cambio Social Mundial” (CIECS – CONICET – UNC) and of the CLACSO Working Group “Teoría Social y Realidad Latinoamericana”. Gorriti has published *Estado, clases sociales y democracia. Un estudio crítico del pensamiento de Nicos Poulantzas* (Estudios Sociológicos Editora, 2018) and *Nicos Poulantzas. Una teoría materialista del Estado* (Doble Ciencia, 2020).

Judith Grant (Ph.D., Political Science, Rutgers University, 1987) is Professor Emeritus in the Department of Political Science at Ohio University. Grant has been a member of the Caucus for Critical Political Science (formerly, the Caucus for a New Political Science) since she was a graduate student at Rutgers University. She was co-editor of *New Political Science* (2020–23), the official journal of the Caucus for a Critical Political Science. She also served as an associate editor of *Gender and Politics* (2016–19). She is the author of *Fundamental Feminism: Radical Feminist History for the Future* (Routledge, 2020) and is currently working on a book on the structure of patriarchy.

Laura Green (Ph.D. English, University of California, Berkeley, 1994) is Professor of English and Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies at Northeastern University, where she has served in administrative roles including Associate Dean, College of Social Sciences and Humanities and Chair, Department of English. She is the author

of *Literary Identification from Charlotte Brontë to Tsitsi Dangarembga* (Ohio State University Press, 2012) and *Educating Women: Cultural Conflict and Victorian Literature*, Ohio University Press, 2001) as well as articles in journals such as *Victorian Literature and Culture*, *Victorian Studies*, and *Twentieth-Century Literature*.

Margaret Groarke (Ph.D., Political Science, City University of New York, 2000) is Professor of Political Science at Manhattan College. She is co-author, with Frances Fox Piven and Lorraine C. Minnite, of *Keeping Down the Black Vote: Race and the Demobilization of American Voters* (2009). She was co-chair and board member of the Peace and Justice Studies Association, and has been involved in community organizing in the Bronx for decades.

Ruth Porter Groff (Ph.D., Political Science, York University, 2003) is an Associate Professor at Saint Louis University. She is former Reviews Editor for *New Political Science*, and a former Editor of the *Journal of Critical Realism*. She maintains a blog called “Powers, Capacities and Dispositions,” and is the Coordinator of the Critical Social Ontology Workshop. Publications include *Ontology Revisited* (Routledge, 2012); (ed.) *Subject & Object: Frankfurt School Writings on Epistemology, Ontology and Method* (Bloomsbury, 2014); (edited with John Greco) *Powers and Capacities in Philosophy*; as well as other books and articles on metaphysics, Marx and philosophy of social science.

William F. Grover (Ph.D., Political Science, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 1987) teaches at Montana State University in Bozeman. Grover is Emeritus Professor of Political Science at Saint Michael’s College in Vermont. His most recent books (with Joseph G. Peschek) are *The Unsustainable Presidency: Clinton, Bush, Obama, and Beyond* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2014); and *Voices of Dissent: Critical Readings in American Politics*, 9th edn (Pearson Longman, 2013). He is a former American Political Science Association Congressional Fellow who worked in the office of then-Congressman Bernie Sanders (I-VT).

Phillip Hansen (Ph.D., Political Economy, University of Toronto, 1981) is Professor Emeritus of Philosophy at The University of Regina. He is the author (with Brian Caterino) of *Critical Theory, Democracy, and the Challenge of Neoliberalism* (University of

Toronto Press, 2019) and *Reconsidering C.B. Macpherson: From Possessive Individualism to Democratic Theory and Beyond* (University of Toronto Press, 2015).

Emily Hauptmann (Ph.D., Political Science, University of California, Berkeley, 1992) is Professor of Political Science at Western Michigan University. She helped found the Association for Political Theory (APT) and served as its Executive Co-Director from 2005 to 2007. She currently serves on the Executive Committee of the International Political Science Association (IPSA)'s Research Committee on the Study of Political Science as a Discipline. Her articles on the history of political science have appeared in *Political Theory*, *The American Political Science Review*, *The Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, *PS: Political Science & Politics*, and *Science in Context*. Her most recent publication is *Foundations and American Political Science: The Transformation of a Discipline, 1945–1970* (University Press of Kansas, 2022).

Mary E. Hawkesworth (Ph.D., Political Science, Georgetown University, 1979) is Distinguished Professor Emerita of Political Science and Women's and Gender Studies, Rutgers University. She served as Editor of *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* (2005–14), Co-Editor with Lisa Disch of the *Oxford Handbook of Feminist Theory* (2015), and Co-Editor with Maurice Kogan of the *Routledge Encyclopedia of Government and Politics* (1992, 2004). Her works include *Gender and Political Theory* (Polity 2019); *Embodied Power: Demystifying Disembodied Politics* (Routledge 2016); and *Feminist Inquiry: From Political Conviction to Methodological Innovation* (Rutgers University Press, 2006).

Stephen R.C. Hicks (Ph.D., Philosophy, 1991) is Professor of Philosophy at Rockford University, Illinois. He is the author of *Explaining Postmodernism: Skepticism and Socialism from Rousseau to Foucault* (2011), *Nietzsche and the Nazis* (2010), *Entrepreneurial Living* (2017), and *Liberalism: Pro and Con* (2020). He has published in *Business Ethics Quarterly*, *Review of Metaphysics*, and *The Wall Street Journal*. His writings have been translated into twenty languages.

Peter Hudis (Ph.D., Philosophy, Loyola University Chicago, 2011) is a Professor of Humanities and Philosophy at Oakton

College and author of *Marx's Concept of the Alternative to Capitalism* (Brill 2012) and *Frantz Fanon: Philosopher of the Barricades* (Pluto 2015). He co-edited *The Power of Negativity: Selected Writings on the Dialectic in Hegel and Marx*, by Raya Dunayevskaya (Lexington 2002), *The Rosa Luxemburg Reader* (Monthly Review 2012) and *The Letters of Rosa Luxemburg* (Verso 2011). He is General Editor of *The Complete Works of Luxemburg*, a 17-volume collection (in progress); he edited Volume I and co-edited Volumes II, III, and IV.

Petros Iosifidis (Ph.D., Media Policy, University of Westminster, London, 1996) is Chair & Professor of Sociology at University of London. He has served as an ESRC/AHRC Peer Review College reviewer, Principal Editor of the *Journal of Digital Media & Policy* (2016–now), and Founder/Co-Editor of the *Palgrave Global Media Policy & Business* (2014–now). He has been Vice-Chair of IAMCR Global Media Policy (2018–2021), and acted as national expert on European projects. His most recent books are *Digital Democracy, Social Media and Disinformation* (Routledge, 2021), *Public Sphere and Mediated Social Networks* (Palgrave, 2016), and *Global Media & National Policies* (Palgrave, 2016).

Russell Jacoby (Ph.D, University of Rochester, History, 1974) has taught in the Department of History at the University of California, Los Angeles for more than 25 years. He is the author of nine books that have been translated into a dozen languages, including *Dialectic of Defeat: Contours of Western Marxism* (1981), *The Last Intellectuals* (1987), *The End of Utopia* (1999), *Bloodlust: The Roots of Violence* (2011), and *On Diversity: The Eclipse of the Individual in a Global Era* (2020).

Manal A. Jamal (Ph.D., Political Science, McGill University 2006) is Professor of Political Science at James Madison University. She is the author of *Promoting Democracy: The Force of Political Settlements in Uncertain Times* (New York University Press, 2019), and her articles have appeared in *Comparative Political Studies*, *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, *International Studies Review*, and *International Migration Review*, as well as in a number of edited volumes. She is a long-standing member of the Caucus for a Critical Political Science, and in 2020,

she chaired the Charles A. McCoy Career Achievement Award Committee.

Andrew Johnson (Ph.D., Political Science, University of California Santa Barbara, 2022) is a Visiting Instructor at Seattle University. He is a member of the Structural Violence, Police/Prison Abolition, and Decoloniality research cluster within the Orfalea Center for Global & International Studies. He has published articles on Friedrich Nietzsche, Martin Heidegger, Gilles Deleuze, Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, David Graeber, and the global emergence of far-right authoritarian populism. He is working on a book manuscript addressing the historical formation and development of police institutions and how these histories are vital to, but also challenge, the contemporary abolition movement.

Kathleen B. Jones (Ph.D., Political Science, CUNY Graduate School and Center, 1978) is Professor Emerita of Women's Studies at San Diego State University and Visiting Research Professor in Gender Studies, Örebro University, Sweden. She has authored and edited nine books on feminist theory and women and politics, including *Sexuality, Gender and Power* with Valerie Bryson and Anna G. Jónasdóttir (Routledge, 2010) and *The Political Interests of Gender Revisited* with Anna G. Jónasdóttir (Manchester University Press, 2009). She served as co-editor of the *International Feminist Journal of Politics* (1998–2005).

Isaac Kamola (Ph.D., Political Science, University of Minnesota, 2010) is Associate Professor of Political Science at Trinity College in Hartford, CT. He has served as section chair of the Global Development Studies section at the International Studies Association (2020–2021) and as co-founder and president of Trinity's American Association of University Professors (AAUP) chapter. He is the author of *Free Speech and Koch Money: Manufacturing a Campus Culture War* (with Ralph Wilson), *Making the World Global: US Universities and the Production of the Global Imaginary* (2019) and co-editor of *Politics of African Anticolonial Archive* (with Shiera Malik, 2017).

Mark Kaswan (Ph.D., Political Science, University of California Los Angeles, 2010) is an Associate Professor of Political Science at The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley. He also holds J. Robert Beyster, Michael W. Huber, and Kellogg Foundation

fellowships from the Rutgers University School of Management and Labor Relations. His recent publications include "Property, Ownership and Employee Ownership: Employee Control in ESOPs," in *Journal of Participation and Employee Ownership* (2022) and "Cooperatives and the Question of Democracy/Genossenschaften und die Frage der Demokratie," in *Zeitschrift für Gemeinwirtschaft und Gemeinwohl Journal of Social Economy and Common Welfare* (2021).

Timothy V. Kaufman-Osborn (Ph.D., Politics, Princeton University, 1982) is the Baker Ferguson Professor of Politics and Leadership Emeritus at Whitman College. Kaufman-Osborn has published work on the death penalty (*From Noose to Needle: Capital Punishment and the Late Liberal State*); feminist theory (*Creatures of Prometheus: Gender and the Politics of Technology*); American pragmatism (*Politics/Sense/Experience: A Pragmatic Inquiry into the Promise of Democracy*); and, more recently, the governance of U.S. colleges and universities (*The Autocratic Academy: A Reenvisioning Rule within America's Universities*). He twice served as president of the Western Political Science Association, and, for several years, as president of the American Civil Liberties Union of Washington.

Michael Keaney (Licentiate, Social Sciences, University of Helsinki, 2012) is currently Senior Lecturer in the business school of Metropolia University of Applied Sciences, Helsinki, Finland. He is a member of the editorial board of the *Review of Radical Political Economics*. His work has also appeared in *World Review of Political Economy*, *Journal of Economic Issues*, *Capitalism Nature Socialism*, *Political Studies Review*, *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, *Health Care Analysis*, and *National Accounting Review*. He is the editor of *Economist with a Public Purpose: Essays in Honour of John Kenneth Galbraith* (Routledge, 2001).

Rafael Khachaturian (Ph.D., Political Science, Indiana University Bloomington, 2017) is Lecturer in the Critical Writing Program at the University of Pennsylvania and Associate Faculty with the Brooklyn Institute for Social Research. He is a member of the Caucus for a Critical Political Science, and the recipient of its 2018 Stephen E. Bronner Dissertation Award. He is the co-editor of *Marxism and the Capitalist State*:

Towards a New Debate (Palgrave Macmillan, 2023). His current book manuscript is titled *The Rediscovery of the State: Crisis and Knowledge Production in Postwar Political Science*.

Daniel T. Kirsch (Ph.D., Political Science, University of Massachusetts Amherst) is a Professor of Political Science at Northern Virginia Community College and the author of *Sold My Soul for a Student Loan: Higher Education and the Political Economy of the Future* (Praeger, 2019).

Robert E. Kirsch (Ph.D., Social, Political, Ethical & Cultural Thought, Virginia Polytechnical Institute & State University, 2012), is Assistant Professor of Leadership and Integrative Studies at Arizona State University. He is a board member of the International Herbert Marcuse Society and membership director of the Caucus for a Critical Political Science. He has previously served as interim Reviews Editor for the journal *New Political Science*. He is co-author of *Worst Case Scenario: The Politics of Prepping in the United States* (Columbia University Press, 2024), editor of the volume *Limits to Terrestrial Extraction* (Routledge, 2020), and co-author of *Critical Leadership Theory* (Palgrave, 2018).

Maddy Koch (M.A., Political Science and Environmental Policy, Appalachian State University, Boone NC, 2022) is an Energy Democracy Field Coordinator with the environmental organization Appalachian Voices working on energy policy in North Carolina. Her research interests include human relationships and conceptualizations of nature and how it is manifested in policy, politics, and activism.

Jason Kosnoski (Ph.D, Political Science, New School for Social Research, 2003) is an Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Michigan–Flint. He is the author of *John Dewey and the Habits of Ethical Life: The Aesthetics of Political Organizing in a Liquid World* (Lexington, 2010) and *The Political Theory of Salvage* (SUNY Press, 2022).

Christopher Kyriakides (Ph.D., Sociology & Anthropology, Political Science, University of Glasgow, 2005) holds the Canada Research Chair in Citizenship, Social Justice and Ethno-Racialization at York University, Canada, where he runs the Racialized Refuge multi-country research

program. He is an Executive Committee member of York University's Centre for Refugee Studies (CRS) and co-lead of the CRS' Racism and Refuge sub-committee. Kyriakides is a former Research Fellow of the Centre for Research in Racism, Ethnicity and Nationalism (University of Glasgow), of the Centre for the Study of Ethnicity and Citizenship (University of Bristol) and Visiting Scholar at the University of California, Irvine.

Chad Lavin (Ph.D, Political Science, Pennsylvania State University, 2003) is Associate Professor of English at the University at Buffalo, SUNY. He served as Reviews Editor for the journal *New Political Science* from 2011–17. He is the author of *The Politics of Responsibility* (University of Illinois Press, 2008) and *Eating Anxiety: The Perils of Food Politics* (University of Minnesota Press, 2013), as well as essays on issues ranging from Hurricane Katrina to the ethics of solidarity to spatial metaphors in political theory.

Michael Lerma, (Ph.D. [P'urhépecha], American Indian Studies, University of Arizona) is Dean of the School of Business and Social Science at Diné College. His recent research explores the efficacy of traditional Diné institutions of governance. His current projects involve the launch of a virtual business incubator and the creation of a data base to locate Missing and Murdered Diné Relatives within Diné Bikéyah.

Michael Anthony Lewis (Ph.D., Sociology, CUNY Graduate Center, 1995) is Professor at the Silberman School of Social Work at Hunter College and the CUNY Graduate Center. At one time, he was a community organizer in the East New York section of Brooklyn, New York and is a co-founder of U.S. Basic Income Guarantee, Inc., an organization dedicated to promoting discussion of universal basic income and related policies. His most recent book is *Social Workers Count: Numbers and Social Issues* (Oxford University Press, 2018).

Tracy L. R. Lightcap is Professor Emeritus of Political Science at LaGrange College. He is the former Chair (1994–2016) of the political science program at LaGrange College. His most recent books are *The Politics of Torture* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2011) and *Examining Torture: Empirical Studies of State Repression* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).

Jake Lin (Ph.D., International Relations, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand, 2016) is Assistant Professor of Political Science at The University of Texas, Rio Grande Valley. He is an Associate Editor for the *Journal of Labor and Society*. He has held academic positions in several countries, including the Faculty of Sociology, Bielefeld University, Germany (2019–present) and the Institute of International Relations, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, Japan (2017–19). His current research explores migrant labor and welfare reconfigurations in global China and Vietnam, funded by the European Research Council. His most recent book is *Chinese Politics and Labor Movements* (Palgrave, 2019).

Michael Lipscomb (Ph.D., Pennsylvania State University) is Professor of Political Science at Winthrop University, where he teaches political theory and environmental politics. His research and teaching interests include the roles of desire, temporality, and aesthetics in political thought and practice. His work has appeared in *New German Critique* and *Administrative Theory and Praxis*. He also is the co-author, with Karen M. Kedrowski, of *Breastfeeding Rights in the United States* (Praeger, 2008).

Stan Luger (Ph.D., Political Science, City University of New York, Graduate Center, 1988) is Professor Emeritus of Political Science and International Affairs at the University of Northern Colorado. He is the author of *Corporate Power, American Democracy and the Automobile Industry* (Cambridge University Press, 2000), which received the Michael Harrington best book award. He is also the co-author, with Brian Waddell, of *What American Government Does* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2017).

Timothy W. Luke (Ph.D., Political Science, Washington University–St. Louis, 1981) is University Distinguished Professor & Chair of the Department of Political Science at Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University in Blacksburg. He is an Associate Editor of the journal *New Political Science* (2008–present), and a former Editorial Board member (1993–2008). His most recent books are *The Palgrave Handbook for Environmental Politics and Theory*, co-edited with Joel J. Kassiola (Springer Nature, 2023), *The Travails of Trumpification* (Telos Press Publishing, 2021), and *Anthropocene Alerts* (Telos Press Publishing, 2019).

Robert L. Mack (Ph.D., Communication Studies, University of Texas–Austin, 2015) is an Honors Faculty Fellow and Associate Teaching Professor at Barrett, the Honors College at Arizona State University. He is co-author of *Critical Media Studies: An Introduction* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2020) with Brian L. Ott. His work has also appeared in *The Journal of the Fantastic in the Arts*, *The Journal of Communication and Religion*, and *Quarterly Review of Film and Video*.

Stacy Maddern (Ed.D., Educational Leadership, University of Hartford, 2018) is an Assistant Professor in Residence at the University of Connecticut in Urban and Community Studies. His scholarly interests include educational history, social movements, social capital and community theory.

Stephen Maher (Ph.D., Political Science, York University, 2020) is Assistant Professor of Economics at SUNY Cortland and Associate Editor of *The Socialist Register*. He is co-author, with Scott Aquanno, of *The Fall and Rise of American Finance: From J.P. Morgan to BlackRock* (Verso, 2024) and he is the author of *Corporate Capitalism and the Integral State: General Electric and a Century of American Power* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2022). He is also co-editor of *State Transformations: Classes, Strategy, Socialism* with Greg Albo and Alan Zuege (Brill, 2021).

Rianne Mahon (Ph.D., Political Science, University of Toronto) is Distinguished Research Professor of Sociology and Anthropology at Carleton University and Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada. She is a member of the International Studies Association, International Political Science Association, and International Sociology Association. Mahon is a former editor of *Studies in Political Economy*, *Global Social Policy*, and *Social Politics* and former Associate Editor of *Economic and Industrial Democracy*. She has co-edited numerous books including *Achieving the Social Development Goals: Global Governance Challenges* (with S. Horton and S. Dalby), and co-authored *Advanced Introduction to Social Policy* (with D. Béland).

Tom Malleson (Ph.D., Political Theory & Political Economy, University of Toronto, 2012) is Associate Professor in the Social Justice and Peace Studies Department at King's University College at Western University, Canada. He is also the coor-

dinator of the Real Utopias Project and a long-time community activist. His most recent books include *Against Inequality: The Practical and Ethical Case for Abolishing the Superrich* (Oxford University Press, 2023), and *Part-Time for All: A Care Manifesto* (with Jenny Nedelsky, Oxford University Press, 2023).

Bonnie Mann (Ph.D., Philosophy, Stony Brook University, 2002) is Professor of Philosophy at the University of Oregon. She is Co-Editor in Chief of *Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy*. She is the author of *Sovereign Masculinity: Gender Lessons from the War on Terror* (Oxford University Press, 2014) and *Women's Liberation and the Sublime* (Oxford University Press, 2006). Recent articles include "Rape and Social Death" (Feminist Theory, 2021); with Burke and Ferrari, "Toward a Phenomenology of Temporal Harm" (*Signs*, 2022); "Femininity, Shame and Redemption," (Gender and the Politics of Shame, a special issue of *Hypatia*, 2018).

Mark Mattern (Ph.D., Political Science, University of Minnesota, 1994) is Professor of Politics and Global Citizenship at Baldwin Wallace University. He is a long-standing member of the Caucus for a Critical Political Science. He is a former Reviews Editor (2002–08) and Co-Editor (2008–14), with Nancy Love, of *New Political Science*, and a member of its Editorial Board since 2002. His recent books include *Anarchism and Art* (SUNY Press, 2016) and *The Trickle-Up Economy: How We Take from the Poor and Middle Class and Give to the Rich* (Lynne Rienner, 2021).

Todd May (Ph.D, Philosophy, Pennsylvania State University, 1989) currently teaches philosophy at Warren Wilson College. He is the author of seventeen books of philosophy, including *The Political Philosophy of Poststructuralist Anarchism* (Penn State Press, 1994), *The Political Thought of Jacques Ranciere* (Edinburgh University Press, 2008), and *Nonviolent Resistance: A Philosophical Introduction* (Polity Press, 2015).

Nancy E. McGlen (Ph.D., University of Rochester, 1975) is the co-author of several articles and books on women's social movements, women in politics, and women in foreign policy, including *Women in Foreign Policy: The Insiders* (Routledge, 1993), written with Meredith Reid Sarkees. She

retired as Professor and Dean Emeritus from Niagara University in 2013.

Sandro Mezzadra (Ph.D. History of Political Thought and Institutions, University of Turin, 1993) is Professor of Political Philosophy at the University of Bologna and Adjunct Research Fellow at the Institute for Culture and Society, Western Sydney University. With Brett Neilson, he is author of *Border as Method, or, the Multiplication of Labor* (Duke University Press, 2013), *The Politics of Operations: Excavating Contemporary Capitalism* (Duke University Press, 2019), and *The West and the Rest: Capital and Power in a Multipolar World* (Verso, 2024).

Massimo Modonesi (Ph.D., Latin-American Studies, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2008) is a Professor in the College of Political and Social Sciences at UNAM. He is a member of the Coordinating Committee of the International Gramsci Society, a member of the editorial board of *Jacobin América Latina*, and a former Editor of the journal *OSAL* (Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales). His books available in English include *Subalternity, Antagonism and Autonomy* (Pluto Press, 2014), *The Antagonistic Principle* (Brill, 2018), *The Impasse of the Latin American Left* (Duke University Press, 2020), and *The Concept of Social Class in Contemporary Marxist Theory* (Ibidem Press, 2022).

Jeta Mulaj (Ph.D., Philosophy, DePaul University, Chicago, 2021) is an Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Toronto Metropolitan University. She is the co-founder of *Balkan Society for Theory and Practice* (2018–present) and a research associate at the *Society for Women of Ideas* (2022–present). Her most recent publications include "Ontology as Ideology: A Critique of Butler's Theory of Precariousness," in *Constellations*, "Creolization's Newness: The Dialectic of Novelty and Sameness," in *Creolizing Critical Theory* (Routledge), and "What Is Immanent Critique? Recovering Marcuse's Critical Theory of Society," in *The Marcusean Mind* (Routledge), "World-Traveling to the Servants' Quarters: The Pseudo-Concreteness of Lugones' Decolonial Feminism," forthcoming in *Hypatia*, and "Classed Bodies: Judith Butler's Materialism" forthcoming in *Judith Butler and Marxism: the Radical Feminism of Performativity, Vulnerability, and Care* (Rowman & Littlefield).

Billie Murray (Ph.D., Communication Studies, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2010) is Associate Professor of Rhetoric and Assistant Director for Academics for the Center for Peace and Justice Education at Villanova University. She is Editor of the journal *Communication and Democracy*. She is the author of *Combating Hate: A Framework for Direct Action* (Pennsylvania State University Press, 2022), which details her research on public responses to hate speech in the United States.

Paolo Murrone (Master's, Philosophical Sciences, University of Bologna, 2020) is a Ph.D. candidate in Philosophy at the University of Pisa and University of Florence (Italy). His interests focus on the Marxian concept of material interchange, Eco-Marxism and radical ecology, and the critical Young Hegelians. He co-edited the volume *Religione e Politica. Paradigmi, alleanze, conflitti* (Ets, Pisa 2022).

Augusta Nannerini is a graduate student at the Geneva Graduate Institute. She obtained a B.A. in Philosophy from La Sapienza University of Rome and a MSc in Refugee and Forced Migration Studies from Oxford University. Before starting her doctorate in Geneva, she worked for three years conducting research in the fields of migration, forced displacement, statelessness and development on behalf of UNHCR, NGOs and Think Tanks. She held positions in different countries, including in Italy, UK, USA (Virginia), Belgium, and Jordan. She is currently a Research Assistant at the Centre on Conflict, Development & Peacebuilding (CCDP) and an affiliate member of the Gender Centre at the Graduate Institute.

Brett Neilson (Ph.D., English, Yale University, 1993) is Professor at the Institute for Culture and Society, Western Sydney University. With Sandro Mezzadra, he is author of *Border as Method, or, the Multiplication of Labor* (Duke University Press, 2013) and *The Politics of Operations: Excavating Contemporary Capitalism* (Duke University Press, 2019).

Olga Patricia Velásquez Ocampo (Ph.D., Law, Los Andes University, Colombia, 2021) is a Postdoctoral Research Fellow at the Law Faculty at Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Bogotá, Colombia. She was a Graduate Research Resident at the Bonavero Human Rights Institute at the University of Oxford (2019–2020). Her recent publications include

“Mobilizing as Mothers Against Violence: The Case of the Mothers of the Candelaria in Medellín, Colombia” in *Women, Creativity and Nonviolence* (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2022) and “Pactantes y no pactadas: mujeres en el proceso de paz entre el Gobierno de Colombia y las FARC-EP” in *Género en transición* (Peter Lang, 2020).

Alix L. Olson (Ph.D., Political Science, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 2018) is Assistant Professor of Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies at Emory University. She is an Associate Editor of the journal *New Political Science*. Her forthcoming books are *The End(s) of Resistance: Making and Unmaking Democracy* (Columbia University Press, 2023), the edited collection *Art, Activism and Contemporary Political Theory* (SUNY Press, 2024), and *Feminist Redemption, Neoliberal Apocalypse* (Bloomsbury Publishing, 2024). Olson's scholarly essays have appeared in edited collections and journals, including *Contemporary Political Theory*, *New Political Science*, and *Wagadu*. Her political poetry has been widely published, including in *Ms.* and *The Progressive* magazines.

Julio Orellana (Ph.D., Ethnic Studies, University of California, Riverside, 2023) is a University of California President's Postdoctoral Fellow at the University of California Santa Barbara. Julio holds a master's degree in political science from California State University, Northridge and he is a member of the Western Political Science Association. His research interests include Latinx Politics, Marxist Political Economy, and Central American Studies. He is currently working on a book manuscript on contemporary multi-racial Guatemalan labor migrations, Latinx labor markets, and migrant civil societies in Southern California.

Brian L. Ott (Ph.D., Speech Communication, Pennsylvania State University, 1997) is Head and Professor of Communication at Missouri State University. He is a former President (2013–14), Program Planner (2012–13), and First Vice President (2011–12) of the Western States Communication Association. He is the former Director of Texas Tech University Press (2018–20) and a former Editor-in-Chief of the *Western Journal of Communication* (2009–11). His most recent books are *Critical Media Studies: An Introduction* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2020) with Robert L. Mack and *The Twitter Presidency:*

Donald J. Trump and the Politics of White Rage (Routledge, 2019) with Greg Dickinson.

Robert Ovetz (Ph.D., Government, University of Texas, Austin, 1996) is a Senior Lecturer in Political Science and teaches labor relations and non-profit management in the Master of Public Administration program at San José State University. He is also a lecturer in Sociology at the University of California, Berkeley. Dr. Ovetz is the author of *We the Elites: Why the US Constitution Serves the Few* (Pluto Press, 2022), which is a class analysis of the U.S. Constitution. He is editor of *Workers' Inquiry and Global Class Struggle* (Pluto Press, 2020), and author of *When Workers Shot Back: Class Conflict from 1877 to 1921* (Brill, 2018/Haymarket Press, 2019). He was also an Associate Editor and contributor to *The Routledge Handbook of the Gig Economy*, edited by Immanuel Ness (Routledge, 2022).

Umut Özsü (S.J.D., Law, University of Toronto, 2011) is an Associate Professor of Law and Legal Studies at Carleton University. He is a scholar of public international law, the history and theory of international law, and Marxist critiques of law, rights, and the state. He is the author of *Completing Humanity: The International Law of Decolonization, 1960–82* (Cambridge University Press, 2023) and *Formalizing Displacement: International Law and Population Transfers* (Oxford University Press, 2015). He is also co-editor of the *Research Handbook on Law and Marxism* (Edward Elgar, 2021) and *The Extraterritoriality of Law: History, Theory, Politics* (Routledge, 2019).

Bryan D. Palmer, Emeritus Professor and former Canada Research Chair, Trent University, Peterborough, Canada is a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada and long-time editor of the journal *Labour/Le Travail*. He has authored, co-authored, or edited more than 25 books on labor and the left, including *James P. Cannon and the Emergence of Trotskyism in the United States, 1928–38* (Brill, 2021).

Kari Palonen (Ph.D., Political Science, University of Helsinki, 1975) is Professor emeritus of Political Science at the University of Jyväskylä, Finland. He was Academy of Finland Professor for two 5-year periods, is the founding editor of the journal *Redescriptions*, the co-founder of the History of Concepts Group and of the ECPR Standing Group Political Concepts. His recent publica-

tions include: *A Political Style of Thinking. Essays on Max Weber* (ECPR Press 2017), *Parliamentary Thinking. Procedure, Rhetoric and Time* (Palgrave, 2019) and *Politik als parlamentarischer Begriff. Perspektiven aus den Plenardebatten des Deutschen Bundestags* (Barbara Budrich, 2021).

James Parisot (Ph.D., Sociology, Binghamton University, 2016) is Assistant Professor of Political Science at The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley. He is the author of the book *How America Became Capitalist: Imperial Expansion and the Conquest of the West* (Pluto, 2019) and co-editor of *American Hegemony and the Rise of Emerging Powers* (Routledge, 2017). He is also editor of the *Journal of Historical Sociology* special issue on “Capitalism and American Empire.” He is currently writing a book on the origins of the U.S. federal state.

Prabhat Patnaik (Ph.D., Economics, Oxford University, 1969) specializes in macroeconomics and political economy and he writes from a Marxist-Leninist perspective. Patnaik taught at the Centre for Economic Studies and Planning in the School of Social Sciences at Jawaharlal Nehru University in New Delhi, India from 1974 until his retirement in 2010. Patnaik, who is a well-known critic of neo-liberal globalization recently published *A Theory of Imperialism* (Columbia University Press, 2016) among many other books he has published over the years.

Mindy Peden (Ph.D. Government, Cornell University, 2004) is Associate Professor of Political Science at John Carroll University, where she has been Chair (2016–20) and Associate Dean (2009–11). She was Co-Chair, with Kam Shapiro, of Foundations of Political Theory for the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting (2013) and served on the Stephen E. Bronner Dissertation Award Committee (2021). Her most recent publications include “Revolutionary Accounting? Methods and Possibilities in Critical Strategy” *New Political Science* 41:4 (2019) and entries on “Profit” and “Monopoly Capitalism” for *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social Theory* (2017).

David N. Pellow (Ph.D., Sociology, Northwestern University, 1998) is the Dehlsen Chair and Distinguished Professor of Environmental Studies at the University of California, Santa Barbara. He is a member of the Advisory Board for *Ethnic Studies*

Review and a member of the Editorial Board for the journal *Environmental Justice*. His most recent books include: *What is Critical Environmental Justice?* (Polity 2017) and *Total Liberation: The Power and Promise of Animal Rights and the Radical Earth Movement* (University of Minnesota Press 2014).

Dusten R. Pettengill is a writer and historian based in Berkeley, California. He worked as an assistant to Dr. Michael Parenti from 2021 to 2023.

Geoffrey Pfeifer (Ph.D., Philosophy, University of South Florida 2012) is Associate Professor of Philosophy and Global Studies at Worcester Polytechnic Institute. He is co-executive editor of *Philosophy in the Contemporary World: An International Journal*. His work can be found in journals such as *Philosophy and Social Criticism*, *Globalizations*, *The European Legacy*, *Crisis and Critique*, *Continental Thought and Theory*, *Contemporary Perspectives in Social Theory* and author of *The New Materialism: Althusser, Badiou, and Žižek* (Routledge, 2015) and co-editor of *Phenomenology and the Political* (Roman and Littlefield International, 2016), and *The Politics of Desire: Foucault, Deleuze and Psychoanalysis* (Rowman and Littlefield, 2022).

Stephen Pimpare (Ph.D., Political Science, City University of New York, 2002) is a Senior Fellow at the Carsey School of Public Policy at the University of New Hampshire. He is the author of *A People's History of Poverty in America* (New Press, 2002), winner of the Michael Harrington Award from the Caucus for a Critical Political Science. His most recent book, *Politics for Social Workers: A Practical Guide to Effecting Change* (Columbia University Press, 2021) won the 2023 Best Book Award from the Society for Social Work and Research.

Frederick Harry Pitts (Ph.D., Global Political Economy, University of Bath, 2017) is a Senior Lecturer in Politics at the Department of Humanities & Social Sciences on the University of Exeter's Cornwall Campus. He is a Co-Investigator of the Economic and Social Research Council Centre for Sociodigital Futures, a fellow of the Institute for the Future of Work, and Secretary of the British Universities Industrial Relations Association. He is the author of *Marx, Management &*

Organisation Studies (Routledge, 2022), *A World Beyond Work? Labour, Money, and the Capitalist State Between Crisis and Utopia* (Emerald, 2021, with Ana Dinerstein), *Value* (Polity 2020), *Corbynism: A Critical Approach* (Emerald, 2018, with Matthew Bolton), and *Critiquing Capitalism Today: New Ways to Read Marx* (Palgrave, 2017).

David J. Plante (Ph.D., Economics, University of Utah, 2004) is Professor of Economics at Western Colorado University. He is former Western Regional Coordinator for the Association of Social Economics. His most recent publication is with T. Christine Jespersen, "Critical Globalization and Political Economy in *Tropic of Orange*" in *Approaches to Teaching the Works of Karen Tei Yamashita*, edited by Ruth Y. Hsu and Pamela Thoma (Modern Language Association, 2021).

William Clare Roberts (Ph.D., Philosophy, The Pennsylvania State University, 2005) is associate professor of political science at McGill University. He is the author of *Marx's Inferno The Political Theory of Capital* (Princeton University Press, 2017).

Joan Roelofs (Ph.D., New York University, 1968) is an activist-scholar and eclectic ecosocialist, who has written about the political influence of foundations and philanthropy, green local public administration, pre-Marxian French socialism, and the culture of militarism. She taught political science at New York University (1961–67), but spent most of her academic career at Keene State College (1979–2003). She attended the founding meeting of the Caucus for a Critical Political Science and was active in the CNPS during the 1980s. She is a founder of RC 49 "Socialism, Capitalism, and Democracy" of the International Political Science Association, which she modeled after CNPS.

Taylor Rogers (Ph.D., Philosophy, Northwestern University, 2021) is an artist-scholar, and Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Interdisciplinary Studies at Governors State University. She teaches courses in Social and Political Philosophy that highlight feminist methods of knowledge production. Rogers sat on the Inclusiveness Committee of the American Philosophical Association (2022–2023) and advised the student wellness team as part of the Northwestern Prison Education Program

(2020–2023). In recently published work (*Hypatia* 2021), Rogers analyses emotional numbness as an inhibitor of political progress. In her forthcoming (2024) contribution to the *Charles Mills Critical Reader* (Routledge), she takes up these themes in relation to Mills' contributions to social contract theory.

Melisa Ross is researcher at the SOCIUM Center on Inequality and Social Policy at the University of Bremen, Germany. She holds a Ph.D. in Political Science from Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin (2022) and has been a fellow at Public Agenda (2021–2022, New York), the WZB Berlin Social Science Center (2017–2021), and a guest researcher at IESP-UERJ (2019, Rio de Janeiro), ICP-UdelaR (2019, Montevideo), and CESLA (2019, Warsaw).

Olivier Rouchet (Ph.D., Political Science, University of Zurich, 2023) is currently Visiting Professor of Political Science at the University of Lucerne, Switzerland. He has previously taught at the University of California, Berkeley, University Paris 2, Humboldt University, and Sciences Po. His work has been published in the *Archives de philosophie du droit, Politics and Gender, Vacarme*, as well as the *Revue du MAUSS*. He is an Associate Editor of the journal *Raison publique*.

Emanuele Saccarelli is Professor of Political Science at San Diego State University. His teaching and research address the following issues: Classical Marxism (Marx, Lenin, Trotsky, Gramsci); the revolutionary struggle for democracy and the entrance of broad popular masses into history as conscious subjects, particularly in the Ancient and Early-Modern periods; and the rise of modern imperialism. He is the author of several academic articles and two books: *Imperialism Past and Present*, co-authored with Latha Varadarajan (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015) and *Gramsci and Trotsky in the Shadow of Stalinism. The Political Theory and Practice of Opposition* (New York: Routledge Press, 2008).

Jokubas Salyga (Ph.D., International Relations, University of Nottingham, 2020) is an Assistant Professor of Political Science at The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley. He is a member of the Association for Slavic, Eastern European and Eurasian Studies and the Association for the Advancement of Baltic Studies. He is the Editor of *Lithuanian Politics* and the culture magazine *Lūžis*. His

articles and commentaries have appeared in the *Economic and Labour Relations Review*, *Europe-Asia Studies*, *Journal of Baltic Studies*, *Historical Materialism*, *Progress in Political Economy*, and *Jacobin*.

Meredith Reid Sarkees (Ph.D., Political Science, University at Buffalo, 1981) has retired from academia, but serves as the President of Global Women's Leadership in International Security. Most of her academic career was spent at Niagara University, with positions as Chair and Professor of Political Science. Her research addressed three major areas: the status of women in academe; women in American foreign policy, and the Correlates of War. A member of the Caucus for a Critical Political Science since 1985, she served as Program Chair, Chair, Managing Editor of the journal *New Political Science*, and she was a member of the journal's editorial board.

Leandros Savvides (Ph.D. Critical Management Studies, Leicester, 2019) is currently a special teaching staff in the Department of Communication and Internet Studies at Cyprus University of Technology. His primary research interests are theory of science and technology, cultural politics, the emergence of citizen science, and civil society interventions in shaping technology and vice versa. His book "3D Printing Cultures, Politics and Hackerspaces" (Emerald Publishing Ltd, 2021) is an ethnographic study which examines the burgeoning 3D printing culture (narratives, grassroots innovation, urban techno-politics) outside the professional lab in Hackerspaces, Makerspaces and Fab Labs.

Gabriele Schimmenti (Ph.D., History of Philosophy, University of Salento and University of Cologne, 2018) is Post-doc Fellow and Adjunct Lecturer at the University of Rome III, Italy. He has been awarded the 2nd Losurdo International Prize 2021. He has written several articles in international journals such as *Critique*, *Historical Materialism*, and *Aufhebung*. He has co-edited with D. Moggach the Italian edition of Bruno Bauer's *On the Principle of the Beautiful* (Palermo University Press, 2018). His first monograph is *L'arte contesa. L'estetica, la sinistra hegeliana e il giovane Marx* (Orthotes, 2021). He is coordinator of the Cologne Mythological Network and a member of the Hegel Art Net.

Sanford F. Schram is Professor Emeritus of the Political Science Department at Hunter College, CUNY. He is also Adjunct Lecturer in Political Science at Stony Brook University, State University of New York. Schram has published sixteen books, including *Words of Welfare* (Minnesota, 1995) and *Disciplining the Poor* (Chicago, 2011), co-authored with Joe Soss and Richard Fording, which both received the Michael Harrington Best Book Award from the Caucus for a Critical Political Science. Schram is a recipient of the CCPS Charles A. McCoy Career Achievement Award. His most recent book, co-authored with Richard Fording, is entitled *Hard White: The Mainstreaming of Racism in American Politics* (Oxford, 2020).

Michael Scipioni (M.A., Political Science, Appalachian State University, 2022) graduated with a Master of Arts in Political Science and a Graduate Certificate in College and University Teaching from Appalachian State University in 2022. Now pursuing a Ph.D. program, Mr. Scipioni aspires to contribute to critical political science research through work on Marxist political thought, global political economy, colonialism, and imperialism.

Bryant William Sculos (Ph.D., Political Science, Florida International University, 2017) is a Lecturer in the Department of Political Science at The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley. He is a member of the Critical Political Science Section of the American Political Science Association and the Politics of Culture Section editor for the open-access journal *Class, Race and Corporate Power*. Bryant is also co-editor (with Mary Caputi) of *Teaching Marx & Critical Theory in the 21st Century* (Brill, 2019/Haymarket, 2020) and author of *The Dialectics of Global Justice: From Liberal to Postcapitalist Cosmopolitanism* (SUNY Press, Series in New Political Science, 2022).

Hamideh Sedghi (Ph.D., Political Science, Graduate Center, City University of New York, 1983) is a professor at the City College of New York. She has served as a member of the Caucus for a Critical Political Science Executive Committee (1972–92). She was the editor of *Women and Politics* and served on the editorial board of the *Review of Radical Political Economy* and is currently on the editorial board of *Socialism and Democracy and Peace Review*. A pioneer in Iranian women's studies, her books include *Women's Protests in Iran: Historical Episodes or*

Social Movements? (Cambridge University Press, 2024) and *Women and Politics in Iran: Veiling, Unveiling, and Reveiling*, (Cambridge University Press, 2007).

Alan Shandro (Ph.D.) is Emeritus Professor of Political Science at Laurentian University, Sudbury, Ontario. He is a member of the editorial Board of *Science & Society* and the author of *Lenin and the Logic of Hegemony* (2015).

Joshua Simon (Ph.D., Political Science, Yale University 2012) is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Johns Hopkins University. His research interests lie at the intersection of political theory and comparative politics, focusing on the relationship between political ideas and political institutions in the United States and Latin America. He is the author of *The Ideology of Creole Revolution: Imperialism and Independence in American and Latin American Political Thought* (Cambridge, 2017), a comparative account of constitutionalism in the period of the American independence movements. He is currently researching efforts to build regional and hemispheric legal orders and political institutions in the Americas in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Dean Snyder (Ph.D., Political Science, Syracuse University, 2015) is Associate Professor of Political Economy and Associate Dean of Academic Affairs at Antioch College. He was the recipient of the Stephen Eric Bronner Dissertation Award (2016) from the Critical Political Science Section of the American Political Science Association (APSA) and served as Critical Political Science divisional program chair for the 2019 APSA annual meeting. His research and commentary have appeared in the journal *New Political Science* and *Jacobin*.

Claire Snyder-Hall (Ph.D., Political Science, Rutgers University, 1997) is an independent scholar and Executive Director of Common Cause Delaware. She was previously on the faculties of Illinois State University (1998–2000) and George Mason University (2000–12). She left higher education due to her frustration with neoliberal trends in the university. Snyder-Hall is perhaps best known for her books, *Citizen-Soldiers and Manly Warriors: Military Service and Gender in the Civic Republican Tradition* (1999) and *Gay Marriage and Democracy: Equality for All* (2003), where she responds directly to “democratic” arguments against marriage equal-

ity leveled by mainstream academics, who portray the traditional patriarchal family as the necessary “seedbed of virtue” underlying democracy. Her most recent book, *Battling the Prince: A Woman Fights for Democracy* (2021) recounts her activities in electoral and movement politics outside of the Academy and contextualizes them within democratic theory.

Manfred B. Steger (Ph.D., Political Science, Rutgers University, 1995) is a Professor of Sociology at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa. Until 2013, he held a joint appointment as Professor of Global Studies at the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (Australia). His main research interests are in globalization, global studies, and social and political theory. Steger has served as Chair of the APSA’s New Political Science Section. He has authored or edited more than 20 books, including *The Rise of the Global Imaginary* (Oxford University Press, 2008); the award-winning *Globalisms: Facing the Populist Challenge*, 4th edn (Rowman & Littlefield, 2020); and the bestselling *Globalization: A Very Short Introduction*, 6th edn (Oxford University Press, 2023).

Michael Stein (Ph.D., Political Science, University of Massachusetts Amherst, 2019) is Associate Director of the Office of Sponsored Research and Foundation Relations and an Instructor at Amherst College. He was a coordinating member of the Amherst Program in Critical Theory (2016–19). His work has appeared in *South Atlantic Quarterly*, *Contemporary Political Theory*, and *TOPIA*. His dissertation is titled *The Solution is the Problem: An Immanent Critique of Capitalism’s Crisis, 2008–2018*.

Mark D. Steinberg (Ph.D., History, University of California, Berkeley, 1987) is Professor Emeritus of History at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He was editor of the interdisciplinary journal *Slavic Review* from 2006 to 2013. His publications include many articles and books on the Russian revolution, utopianism, cities, moralities, and emotions, including *Proletarian Imagination: Self, Modernity, and the Sacred in Russia, 1910–1925* (Cornell University Press, 2002 [Russian translation 2022]), *The Russian Revolution, 1905–1921* (Oxford University Press, 2017 [Russian translation 2017]), and *Russian Utopia: A Century of Revolutionary Possibilities* (Bloomsbury, 2021).

Roni Strier (Ph.D. Social Work, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 2002) is Professor Emeritus at the School of Social Work at the University of Haifa. His areas of research are social exclusion and poverty. He is Chair of the Israel National Council of Food Security and founder and researcher of the Interdisciplinary Center for the Study of Poverty and Social Exclusion at Haifa University. Professor Strier has published multiple articles in main academic journals such as *Journal of Social Policy*, *British Journal of Social Work*, *Social Work*, *Social Review Service*, and other leading journals.

Sarah M. Surak (Ph.D., Planning, Governance, and Globalization, Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University, 2012) is an Associate Professor of Political Science at Salisbury University (Maryland, USA). Surak served as Secretary of the Caucus for a Critical Political Science (2017–2022) and as APSA/CCPS Program Co-Chair (2022). She served as the Book Reviews Editor (2017–2019) and Interim Co-Editor of the journal *New Political Science* (2019–2020). She serves as Co-Editor of *New Political Science* 2023–2026) with Andrew Scerri, and is a former Reviews Editor (2017–2019) and Interim Co-Editor (2019–2020) of *New Political Science*.

Marvin Surkin (Ph.D., Political Science New York University, 1972) was a founding member of the Caucus for a Critical Political Science in 1967. Surkin helped lead the CNPS in a more radical direction when he co-edited (with Alan Wolfe), *An End to Political Science: The Caucus Papers* (1970). His most influential book (with Dan Georgakas) is *Detroit: I Do Mind Dying, A Study in Urban Revolution* (1975), which recounts how black autoworkers organized their own union in the 1970s – the Dodge Revolutionary Union Movement (DRUM) in opposition to the white-dominated, and sometimes racially discriminatory, United Auto Workers. Since 2008, Surkin has been a professor at the Intercultural Open University Foundation, an international non-profit charitable organization that provides distance learning courses to master’s and Ph.D. students in developing countries.

Donald Swartz (Ph.D., School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, 1972) was a Professor (retired) in the School of Public Policy and Administration at Carleton University in Ottawa Canada. He has been a member of the Editorial Board

and Executive Committee of *Studies in Political Economy: A Socialist Review* since 1980. He is the author of *From Consent to Coercion: The Assault on Trade Union Freedoms* (Garamond Press, 2003) with Leo Panitch. A fourth edition of that book by the University of Toronto Press (with Bryan Evans, Carlo Fanelli and Leo Panitch) was published in 2023.

Katie Temple (Ph.D. candidate, Political Science, University of Oregon) is a graduate teaching fellow of Political Science at the University of Oregon. She was awarded the Wayne Morse Center Graduate Research Fellowship on the economic organization of work and its social transformation in 2021.

Göran Therborn (Ph.D., Sociology, Lund University, Sweden, 1974) is Professor Emeritus of Sociology at the University of Cambridge, UK. He is on the Editorial Board of *Emancipation* and of *International Critical Thought*. His most recent books are *Inequality and the Labyrinths of Democracy* (Verso, 2020) and *Cities of Power* (Verso, 2017).

A. Javier Treviño (Ph.D., Sociology, Boston College, 1990) is Chair and Professor of Sociology at Wheaton College in Massachusetts. He is past president (2000–02) of the Justice Studies Association and past president (2010–11) of the Society for the Study of Social Problems. His recent books are *Leon Petrazycki: Law, Emotions, Society*, edited with Edorado Fittipaldi, (Routledge, 2022), *Investigating Social Problems*, 3rd edn (SAGE Publications, 2021), and *The Emerald Guide to C. Wright Mills* (Emerald, 2021).

Marcel Marius van der Linden (Ph.D., Sociology, University of Amsterdam) was director of research at the International Institute of Social History until 2014. He is currently a Senior Researcher at the Institute, and a professor at the University of Amsterdam. Van der Linden was elected the first president of the International Social History Association (2005–20). Van der Linden is widely recognized for his approach to “global labor history,” which he has developed since the 1990s. He is a recipient of the René Kuczynski Prize (Berlin/Vienna 2009) and the Bochumer Historikerpreis (2014).

Latha Varadarajan is Professor of Political Science and Director of the Program on International Security and Conflict

Resolution (ISCOR) at San Diego State University. Her research is located at the intersection of international relations theory, international political economy, and international security. She is the author of numerous articles and two books, *The Domestic Abroad: Diasporas in International Relations* (Oxford University Press, 2010), and *Imperialism Past and Present*, co-authored with Emanuele Saccarelli (Oxford University Press, 2015). She is currently working on a project that brings together international law and international relations to discuss the contemporary development of a legal-humanitarian world order.

Vanessa Gauthier Vela (Ph.D., International Relations/Political Science, Geneva Graduate Institute, Switzerland, 2023) is an affiliated researcher at the Geneva Graduate Institute and a visiting lecturer at the Vienna School of International Studies. Her most recent article “MINUSMA and the Militarization of UN Peacekeeping” was published in *International Peacekeeping* (2021).

Henry Veltmeyer (Ph.D., Political Science, McMaster University, 1976) is Research Professor in Development Studies at the Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas (Mexico), and Professor Emeritus in International Development Studies at Saint Mary’s University (Canada). He is also editor of the Critical Development Studies book series at Routledge, UK, and Fernwood Publications, Halifax. He is editor of *The Essential Guide to Critical Development Studies* (Routledge, 2017, 2021) and coauthor of *Critical Development Studies: An Introduction* (Fernwood Publications, 2018). He has authored and coedited over 50 books focused on issues such as globalization, imperialism, the class struggle, and capitalist development in Latin America.

Roberto Veneziani (Ph.D., Economics, London School of Economics and Political Science, 2005) is Professor of Economic Theory at Queen Mary University of London. He is a member of the Union for Radical Political Economics, the Association for Heterodox Economics, and the Association for Social Economy. He is Editor of the *Review of Social Economy* and the *Journal of Economic Surveys*, and Associate Editor of *Metroeconomica*. He has published widely in economics, political science and political philosophy on topics of exploitation, distributive justice, and normative economics. His most recent book is *Value, Competition,*

and Exploitation. Marx's Legacy Revisited (Edward Elgar, 2018).

Willow Verkerk (Ph.D., Philosophy, KU Leuven, Belgium, 2015) is Lecturer in Continental Philosophy and Social Philosophy at the University of British Columbia and a Postdoctoral Researcher with the Gendered Mimesis Project at KU Leuven. She was formerly Lecturer in Modern European Philosophy at Kingston University (2016–17). Her recent publications include “Friedrich Nietzsche” in *Rethinking Political Thinkers* (Oxford University Press, 2023), “A Feminist Genealogy of the Post-Enlightenment Subject” *Graduate Faculty Philosophy Journal* 42.1 (2021): 27–51, *Nietzsche and Friendship* (Bloomsbury, 2019), and “Reification, Sexual Objectification, and Feminist Activism” in *The Spell of Capital* (Amsterdam University Press, 2017).

Jelle Versieren is a postdoctoral researcher at the University of Antwerp, Centre for Urban History, Department of History. He is a lecturer at Ghent University for respectively the Department of History, Department of Philosophy and Moral Sciences, and Department of Conflict and Development Studies. He writes extensively about the economic and political transitions of West-European societies towards capitalism, history of economic thought, history of modern critical philosophy, and history of Marxist thought in Western Europe and Japan. He is a guest editor for *History of Intellectual Culture* and recently participated in the book project *Routledge Handbook of Marx's Capital*.

Stanislav Vysotsky (Ph.D., Sociology, Northeastern University, 2009) is an Associate Professor in the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice at the University of the Fraser Valley. He is a member of the editorial board of the journal *Critical Criminology* (2015–present) and a member of the critical criminology division of the American Society of Criminology (2009–present). His most recent book is *American Antifa: The Tactics, Culture, and Practice of Militant Antifascism* (Routledge, 2020).

Amentahru Wahlrab (Ph.D., International Studies, University of Denver—Joseph Korbel School of International Studies, Denver, CO, 2010) is Associate Professor and Graduate Advisor of Political Science at the University of Texas at Tyler. He is Co-editor of the *Global Populisms* book series and the Book

Review editor for *Populism* and a member of the journal's editorial board. He is the coauthor of *What is Global Studies? Theory and Practice* (Routledge, 2017) and co-editor of *U.S. Approaches to the Arab Uprisings: International Relations and Democracy Promotion* (I.B.Tauris, 2018).

Victor Wallis (Ph.D., Political Science, Columbia University, 1970) is a professor in the Liberal Arts & Sciences department at the Berklee College of Music. He is a former Chair (1977–78) of the Caucus for a Critical Political Science, a member of the *New Political Science* editorial board (1978–present), and was the managing editor of *Socialism and Democracy* (1997–2017). He is the author of *Red-Green Revolution: The Politics and Technology of Ecosocialism* (Political Animal Press, 2018/2022), *Democracy Denied: Five Lectures on U.S. Politics* (Africa World Press, 2019) and *Socialist Practice: Histories and Theories* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2020).

Michael Wayne (Ph.D. Film Studies, Middlesex University, London, 1999) is a Professor of Media and Film Studies at Brunel University (London). He is the co-editor of the *Marxism and Culture* series at Pluto Press, a corresponding editor for the journal *Historical Materialism*, and an assistant editor for *The Journal of Class and Culture*. His most recent books include as editor (with Deirdre O'Neill) *Considering Class, Theory, Culture and the Media in the 21st Century* (Brill, 2018), *England's Discontents, Political Cultures and National Identities* (Pluto 2018) and *Marxism Goes to the Movies* (Routledge, 2020).

C.L. Welker (Ph.D., Political Science, Colorado State University, 2019) is an Assistant Professor of Political Science and International Affairs at the University of Northern Colorado. They are an active member of the Caucus for a Critical Political Science. Their current research project engages the work of poststructuralist and new materialist thought to critically evaluate the ways in which environmental political theories understand the production of subjectivity in relation to environmental activism and political change.

Sarah Marie Wiebe (Ph.D., Political Science, University of Ottawa, 2013) is an Assistant Professor in the School of Public Administration at the University of Victoria, where she teaches in the graduate Community

Development program. She is the author of *Life Against States of Emergency* (2023) and *Everyday Exposure: Indigenous Mobilization and Environmental Justice in Canada's Chemical Valley* (2017). Her research focuses on interpretive policy analysis, critical policy studies, environmental justice, public engagement, deliberative democracy and critical ecofeminism. She is a Co-Founder of the Feminist Environmental Research Network (FERN), Director of the Design Justice Collaboratory, a Board Member of the Climate Disaster Project, and Co-Director of the Seascape Indigenous Storytelling Studio.

Angela Wigger (Ph.D., Political Sciences, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, 2008) is Associate Professor of Global Political Economy at Radboud University, The Netherlands. She is the former Chair (2017–19) and Vice-Chair (2015–17) of the *Critical Political Economy Research Network* (CPERN), Editor of *Capital & Class*, and Supervisory Board Member of the *Centre for Research of Multinational Corporations* (SOMO) in Amsterdam (since 2015). Her most recent publications are “Housing as a Site of Accumulation in Amsterdam and the Creation of Surplus Populations” in *Geoforum* (2020) and “The New EU Industrial Policy: Authoritarian Neoliberal Structural Adjustment and the Case for Alternatives” in *Globalizations* (2019).

Gregory P. Williams (Ph.D., Political Science, University of Connecticut, 2015) is an Associate Professor of Political Science at Simmons College. He is the author of *Contesting the Global Order: The Radical Political Economy of Perry Anderson and Immanuel Wallerstein* (SUNY Press, 2020).

Mary E. Witlacil (Ph.D., Political Science, Colorado State University, 2023) is an Assistant Professor at South Dakota School of Mines and Technology. She is an executive council member for the American Political Science Association's Environmental Politics and Theory Related Group, a member of the Caucus for a Critical Political Science. She is a critical theorist and an environmental political theorist whose research centers on theorizing critical ecopessimism. She has expertise in Western Marxism, environmental justice, climate justice, the politics of climate change, as well as contemporary and historical political thought. Her most recent article, “The Critical Pessimism of Theodor Adorno” was published in *New Political Science* in 2022.

Mark D. Wood (Ph.D. Religion, Syracuse University, 1995) is an Associate Professor of Religious Studies Virginia Commonwealth University. He previously served as Director of the VCU's School of World Studies (2013–21). Wood co-chairs the Religion and Nature section of the Southeastern Region of the American Academy of Religion. His research focuses on religion, racism, and working-class politics. His most recent publications include a chapter on Cornel West for *African American Political Thought* (University of Chicago Press, 2020) and an essay on Charles H. Long. He serves on the steering committee of United Campus Workers.

Kenton Worcester (Ph.D., Political Science, Columbia University, 1990) is a Professor of Political Science at Marymount Manhattan College. His books include *C.L.R. James: A Political Biography* (SUNY Press, 1996); *The Social Science Research Council, 1923–1998* (SSRC, 2001); *Violence and Politics: Globalization's Paradox* (Routledge, 2002); *Navigating Political Science: Professional Development and Success in the Discipline* (APSA, 2018); and *Pi Sigma Alpha: A Centennial History* (Pi Sigma Alpha, 2023).

Katherine E. Young (Ph.D., Political Science, Colorado State University, 2008) is Professor and Chair of the Department of Administration of Justice at the University of Hawaii at Hilo. She has written on political theory and animal relations, critical theory, critical political science, fascism, and the potential for authoritarianism in liberal democracies. Her most recent article (with Bradley J. Macdonald) is “Critical Theory, Fascism and Antifascism: Reflections from a Damaged Polity” in *Emancipations: A Journal of Critical Social Analysis* (2021).

Gillian Youngs (Ph.D., International Relations, Nottingham Trent University, U.K., 1997) is Visiting Professor of Design and Digital Strategy at the University of Greenwich. She is a former Vice-President of the International Studies Association (2008–09) and former Chair of its Feminist Theory and Gender Studies Section (2001–02). She was founding co-editor of *International Feminist Journal of Politics* in 1999 and continues to serve on its International Advisory Council. Her books include *Global Political Economy in the Information Age: Power and Inequality* (Routledge, 2007) and

International Relations in a Global Age: A Conceptual Challenge (Polity, 1999).

Patrizia Zannoni is a Professor of Organization Studies at the School of Social Sciences of Hasselt University (Belgium). Drawing on critical theories including Marxism, critical discourse analysis and post-structuralist theories, her research investigates diversity and value under capitalism, the role of identities and technology in control and resistance, and the possibilities to organize the

economy and society otherwise. She is currently Co-Editor-in-Chief of *Organization: The Critical Journal of Organization, Theory & Society*. In 2022, she received an Emma Goldman Award for her work on inequality.

Alan Zuege is an Associate Editor of the *Socialist Register* and co-editor of the Socialist Register Classics book series with Haymarket Books. He is co-editor (with Greg Albo and Stephen Maher) of *State Transformations: Classes, Strategy, Socialism* (Brill, 2021).

Preface

The *Encyclopedia of Critical Political Science* originated during the early days of the COVID-19 pandemic as I sat in my office at the University of Texas Rio Grande Valley. As a Department Chair, I was one of the few university employees whose physical presence on campus the State of Texas considered “essential” to the continued operations of the university. On May 4, 2020, only six weeks after our university had converted to fully online instruction, and everyone else had been sent home, I received an email from Daniel Mather, an editor at Edward Elgar Publishing asking if I “might be interested” in editing a proposed *Encyclopedia of Critical Political Science*. I had long been working on a history of the Caucus for a Critical Political Science, and with a lot of quiet time on my hands, I decided I could not pass up the offer to undertake such an important, if formidable, project.

I submitted a proposal that included several dozen possible entries and the names of an editorial advisory team to assist me with the project. The original project was to be a book of approximately 200,000 words. However, as I discuss below, it was not long before the project ballooned to 439,000 words, and many would argue that it is still not long enough to fully capture critical political science in the United States, much less around the world. As it stands, the *Encyclopedia* consists of 248 separate entries, including theoretical and methodological essays (46), conceptual essays (71), biographical essays (116), and reviews of some of the leading journals in critical political science (15). These essays have been authored by 182 different individuals, whose career status spans the entire spectrum from graduate student to professor emerita/us. The majority (66 percent) of the authors are employed at U.S. institutions of higher education, but approximately one-third of the authors are affiliated with universities in 19 other countries, especially Canada and countries of the European Union.¹ While critical political science is anchored in the concepts and methods of the political science discipline, it simultaneously and self-consciously

crosses disciplinary boundaries to incorporate topics, concepts, and methods utilized by other disciplines in the social sciences and humanities. Thus, while a majority (57 percent) of the authors are employed by political science departments, a large plurality (43 percent) of the authors are affiliated with departments or programs in 24 other disciplines and interdisciplinary fields, such as sociology, philosophy, history, economics, law, women’s and gender studies, English, and communications, among many others. Needless to say, it required an enormous effort by the Editorial Advisory Team to identify prospective authors and to coordinate and edit this wealth of outstanding entries with authors having different levels of experience, as well as a multiplicity of specialized disciplinary jargons and disciplinary conventions. We owe a great deal of thanks to the Editorial Advisory Team, which included Jennifer Leigh Disney (Winthrop College), Gilberto Garcia (Central Washington University), Nancy S. Love (Appalachian State University), Bradley J. Macdonald (Colorado State University), William Niemi (Western Colorado University), Rodolfo D. Torres (University of California, Irvine), Joseph G. Peschek (Hamline University), and William W. Sokoloff (University of Texas Rio Grande Valley). At the same time, I speak for the entire editorial team in thanking our authors for providing each of us with an excellent education in critical political science with their outstanding contributions to the *Encyclopedia*. We learned a great deal from reading and editing the essays and, hopefully, our readers will come away with the same experience.

While it is easy to quantify the number of entries, authors, ranks, and affiliations, I cannot make a definitive assessment of the distribution of methodological and ideological commitments among the *ECPS*’s contributors, but suffice it to say that the *Encyclopedia* runs the gamut from disenchanted liberals to multiple varieties of Marxists to an equally diverse array of Post-Marxists, Post-structuralists,

Post-modernists, Feminists, Ecologists, and others. One can find a few critical pluralists, radical and participatory democrats, feminists of various persuasions, communists, and even a few anarchists among the contributors. However, the contributors' ideological center of gravity is no doubt "socialist," although one will find a great deal of variation in the meaning different authors assign to that term.

In this regard, the *ECPS* has strived to provide a comprehensive overview of critical political science since the end of World War II, and despite focusing primarily on critical political science in the United States, it has no doubt fallen far short of even this modest original goal. In particular, there are journals, concepts, and people that we could have included in the *ECPS*, but space and time limitations made it impossible to further expand the *Encyclopedia*. Fortunately, many of these omitted concepts and people are discussed, or at least referenced, in various essays included in the *ECPS*. Yet, readers will no doubt wonder what criteria we used to decide which entries made it into the *ECPS* and which did not make into the *ECPS*.

The original list of entries and the structure of the *ECPS* was initially my editorial decision based on having been a critical political scientist for 39 years and an activist and officer in the Caucus for a Critical Political Science (CCPS) since 1994. I have also been doing research for a history of the CCPS since 2008. Indeed, one of the greatest personal joys of this project is that it provided me with the opportunity to connect with many of the founders and early activists in the Caucus for a Critical Political Science. I spent many hours on the internet tracking down some of these individuals, who had become legends and myths with the passage of time.

Following the development of a first list of proposed topics, I assembled an Editorial Advisory Team, which included individuals who are recognized scholars in Marxism, Critical Ethnic and Race Studies, Post-modernism, Post-structuralism, Feminism, Post-Marxism, and Cultural Studies. The Editorial Advisory Team reviewed my original list of proposed topics and this review resulted in the addition of new entries, while some of the original entries were deleted as duplicative or tangential to the project. We also quickly reached a decision to not include "Great Books" thinkers, such as G.W.F. Hegel or Karl Marx, mainly because there are already dictionaries and handbooks on the history of ideas and political thought that cover these figures. We also decided

to exclude intellectuals who rose to prominence before World War II and, thus, we excluded many important figures such as Karl Kautsky, V.I. Lenin, Rosa Luxemburg, Charles A. Beard, Richard T. Ely, John R. Commons, and Staughton Lynd (who were on the original list).

Instead, we decided to focus on "contemporary" political scientists, who had influenced the development of critical political science in the United States over the last half century, and this influenced our decisions about what theoretical, methodological, and conceptual essays to include in the *Encyclopedia*. Importantly, however, this decision did not preclude us from including many biographical essays on figures from outside the United States, or methodological essays such as the one on the British Marxist historians, because critical political science has been regularly and significantly influenced by scholars from all over the world and many of these figures are included in the *Encyclopedia*. While Bernard Crick once argued that one could identify a peculiarly *American* science of politics,² it is not possible to discuss *critical* political science in the United States without including scholars and scholarship from Europe, Latin America, and Africa.

As we began to solicit authors for our revised and expanded list of entries, many contributors suggested that we add major essays, conceptual essays, and biographical essays, and many of these suggestions were incorporated into an ever-expanding list of *ECPS* topics over the next two years. As the project evolved over time, there were many suggestions that probably should have been included in the *ECPS* but they were not included because of time constraints and word limits. Thus, while we would like to call the *Encyclopedia* a comprehensive treatment of critical political science, it is in reality a first cut at providing an overview of critical political science in the United States and, thereby, it indirectly includes significant scholars and scholarship from elsewhere in the world.

The Editor and the Editorial Advisory Team identified potential authors in a wide variety of ways. We first relied on our personal expertise and knowledge of various subfields to identify individuals who we thought were conducting significant research in the areas covered by the *ECPS*, although we quickly exhausted this reservoir of potential contributors. Thus, once identified by the Editorial

Advisory Team, we asked potential authors to recommend other potential authors, who were contacted by the Editor or a member of the Editorial Advisory Team. In addition, and on multiple occasions, we solicited potential authors on the Caucus for a Critical Political Science list serve and these calls elicited numerous responses. The Editor posted a “call for potential authors” on academia.edu and researchgate.net, which generated a great deal of international interest from potential contributors. Furthermore, during the last three years, I spent countless hours searching Academia.edu, J-STOR, Amazon.com, and the Library of Congress catalogue to identify scholars who had written books or articles on the topics covered by the *ECPS*. The Editor also owes a debt of gratitude to the *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, which publicized our call for authors on its Twitter feed to great effect. A few of our authors also deserve special thanks for their exceptional efforts in helping to identify potential contributors and for writing several entries for the *Encyclopedia*, including Greg Albo, Clement Fatovic, William F. Grover, Michael Keaney, Nancy S. Love, Stacy Maddern, Mindy Peden, Joseph G. Peschek, Melisa Ross, Bryant William Sculos, Dean Snyder, and Victor Wallis.

Unfortunately, we could not escape the fact that some highly qualified potential authors rejected our overtures due to prior commitments, while a few individuals who agreed to write important entries simply failed to meet their deadlines and commitments. In both cases, we had to make the difficult decision to drop some important entries from the *ECPS*. One of the most surprising aspects of editing the *ECPS* was discovering that critical social science journals are such highly charged and politicized institutions that many scholars were reluctant to write about them. Thus,

there are a large number of critical social science journals that the Editor wanted to include in the *ECPS*, but they were often self-excluded for “political” reasons known only to those journals’ editors and editorial boards.

Finally, we note that the *ECPS* is designed in a modular format so that every theoretical and methodological essay, and every conceptual and biographical essay stands as an independent contribution that can be read and understood without reference to any other section or entry in the *ECPS*. Our hope is that this design provides a handy reference for research scholars who are engaged in doing critical political science. We also hope that the *ECPS*, and its individual entries, become an instructional resource for college and university teachers, who are looking for short overviews and essays that can be assigned to students in a variety of different courses. As we are profoundly aware of the limitations of the current work, it is our fervent hope that the increasing digitization of publishing makes it possible to treat the *Encyclopedia* as a living document that can be updated and expanded periodically by future editorial teams.

Clyde W. Barrow, Editor

Encyclopedia of Critical Political Science
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, May 2023

Notes

1. These authors are affiliated with universities in Canada (22), United Kingdom (11), Switzerland (4), Netherlands (3), Italy (3), Finland (2), Belgium (2), Israel (2), Brazil (2), Colombia (2), Argentina (1), Mexico (1), United Arab Emirates (1), Germany (1), Cyprus (1), Greece (1), Australia (1), South Africa (1), and India (1).
2. Bernard Crick, *The American Science of Politics* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1959).

What is critical political science?

Clyde W. Barrow

The *Encyclopedia of Critical Political Science* is the first effort to offer a comprehensive overview of the methods, approaches, concepts, scholars, and journals that have come to be recognized as *critical* political science in the United States or that have influenced the development of critical political science over the last six decades. The *Encyclopedia* does not identify critical political science with any one method, ideology, or school of thought, nor does it confine itself to the traditional disciplinary boundaries and subfields that constitute the official political science discipline as it is represented in most flagship political science journals. Consequently, the *Encyclopedia* seeks to highlight scholars and scholarship that is often ignored or dismissed by the official political science discipline, precisely because that scholarship generates knowledge that is critical of existing economic and political systems, including the multiple institutions and policies that support and reproduce those systems. As politically engaged scholarship, critical political science seeks to identify political trajectories that promote the building of a new society based on a democratic and egalitarian economic, social, and political order without class exploitation, institutionalized racism and sexism, imperialism, and catastrophic environmental destruction.

A critique of political science

The *Encyclopedia of Critical Political Science* is being published in the context of a discipline that has long been defined by a “small, and doubtless expanding pond of disciplinary historians,” who offer up a variety of histories, interpretations, and critiques of political science and its various subfields (Seidelman 1990, 596). However, what began as a small cottage industry in the 1960s has grown to industrial proportions, as books and articles proliferate on the origins of political science (Ross 1991; Easton et al. 1995; Furner 2011), the historical develop-

ment of political science (Crick 1959; Somit and Tanenhaus 1967; Gunnell 1993; Farr et al. 1995), the contemporaneous “state of the discipline” of political science (Finifter 1983, 1993; Katznelson and Milner 2002), and “the future of political science” (Lasswell 2005). Indeed, by the mid-1990s, the history of the social sciences had become a recognized interdisciplinary field of study among professional historians and among specialized scholars in the various social science and humanities disciplines (Easton et al. 1995).

As the number of disciplinary histories proliferated in political science, it became evident that there was not a single history of the discipline, but histories of the discipline. There were disagreements about whether political science met the criteria to call itself a discipline as compared to physics with its Standard Model (Oerter 2006; Mann 2010). There were questions about whether political science had undergone one or two or three “paradigmatic revolutions” or whether this amorphous thing we call political science ever had anything that could be called a “paradigm” comparable to Newtonian mechanics (Kuhn 1962). There were even questions about whether political science had ever generated a genuine “theory” as compared to the theory of gravity or the theory of special relativity. However, even if one dismissed such quibbling as the consequence of old and misguided scientific aspirations, disciplinary historians could not even agree on the significance of individual scholars to the development of modern political science with competing narratives claiming that A. Lawrence Lowell,¹ Charles Merriam,² and George Catlin should be regarded as the founding father of the behavioral revolution and this posed the problem of whether the behavioral revolution began in the 1920s, the 1950s, or had been present at the very inception of the discipline.³ There has been an equally vibrant cottage industry in the production of handbooks and encyclopedias of political science that purport to define

and fix a disciplinary paradigm and its key concepts or to at least define some sub-field or area of study within it. Yet, what is missing from most of these works is any recognition of what we call *critical* political science. Critical political science simply does not exist in the extant histories, handbooks, and encyclopedias of the discipline and when it does warrant a mention, it is only a sentence or two intended to dismiss this undercurrent of the discipline as unworthy of study or serious consideration.

Discipline against profession

However, there has always been a critical political science in the United States going back to Charles A. Beard (1913), who can also reasonably be considered one of the discipline's founders (Barrow 2000). Yet, the story told by most of the extant disciplinary histories is a narrative of the triumph of positivist philosophy, behavioral methodology, and formal modeling as the inevitable and rightful outcome of a fair competition in the free market of ideas, where "the best" ideas emerged from a meritocratic clash of intellectual titans. In this narrative, critical political science has largely been written out of the history of the discipline, and it is now simply ignored by the Brahmin priests of the discipline, because it does not fit into the official narrative.

The irony of this still hegemonic positivist philosophy of science is that while it claims to define *the* scientific method, it is not an empirical or behavioral description of the social and intellectual practices of living political scientists. It is a *normative* theory that purports to tell political scientists how they *ought* to conduct their scientific activities (Cohen and Nagel 1934; Hempel 1965; Popper 1959) in contrast to how most of us actually do them. An empirical, as opposed to a normative, definition of political science is that political science is what people who are credentialed as political scientists do in the day-to-day practice of their discipline. Methodology, as defined by Max Weber (1949) is simply self-reflection about what political scientists do and how they do it. Thus, in asking the question "What is Political Science?", Joan Roelofs, a founding member of the Caucus for a Critical Political Science, observes that an empirical

(as opposed to a normative) definition of political science would simply:

aggregate what political scientists do. This would include papers at conferences, journal articles, books, the content of undergraduate teaching and graduate training for political scientists, and advice to government, interest groups, political movements, and aspiring politicians ... the aggregation must be broad to include political science throughout the world and the activities of most political scientists, who are not at elite institutions."⁴

While Roelofs notes that such a project would require considerable time, a large team of researchers, and a very large budget, it is from such a perspective that I draw a distinction between official hegemonic political science and mainstream political science. A study of the type proposed by Roelofs will probably never be undertaken precisely because it would likely reveal that critical political science is mainstream political science, if one identifies "science" with what the majority of political scientists do in practice. Official political science is a normative philosophy about what certain professional elites at Ivy League and other R1 institutions think others *ought* to be doing if they want to claim the occupational title of being a "political scientist," but this means that it is really nothing more than an ideological artifact of the profession's relation to the state, corporations, and political power (Hauptmann 2022).

A starting point for defining critical political science might be the original Constitution of the Caucus for a New Political Science (1979), which states that a "new political science" was being organized "to help make the study of politics relevant to the struggle for a better world." In 2021, when the organization changed its name to the Caucus for a Critical Political Science, its articles of incorporation and constitution were amended to give more substance to its mission as "an association of critical scholars committed to making the study of political science relevant to building a more democratic and egalitarian economic, social, and political order" (Government 2021). The essays collected in the *Encyclopedia of Critical Political Science* exemplify and expand upon both of these principles.

While many disciplinary historians have dismissed critical political science as a minor

eruption on the margins of the discipline, the fact that the Caucus was still being talked about in the *APSR* nearly 40 years after its founding by scholars such as John Dryzek (2006) and John G. Gunnell (2006) suggests that critical political science cannot be ignored, despite the best efforts of the profession's court historians to dismiss it in one or two sentences. In fact, as Seidelman observes, the confrontation between the discipline of political science and the official profession initiated by CNPS in 1967 left political scientists at a professional impasse by the mid-1980s, with the result that the discipline once again revolted against the profession in 2000. This impasse had clearly not been resolved on the 100th anniversary of the American Political Science Association, even though Seidelman (1985, 240–41) had earlier written “an epitaph for political science as it has been practiced in the United States.”

Official versus mainstream political science

When the intellectual founders of critical political science declared an end to political science, they were not proposing to abolish the discipline of political science, but they were challenging what I call official political science. In this respect, it is necessary to reassert the presence of critical political science within the discipline and to emphasize that critical political science is a major component of the discipline's *mainstream* even though it is in conflict with the *official* profession as reproduced through the profession's regulatory apparatus. For instance, when the CCPS last ran a slate of candidates for APSA Council in 2011, in coalition with Perestroika (Monroe 2005), its candidates won approximately 35 percent of the votes cast (without even running a serious campaign) (Association News 2011), which suggests that critical political science is a much more substantial element of the discipline than is reflected in the official organs of the APSA and the regional political science associations. Thus, it is my contention that most discussions of the political science discipline mistakenly conflate official political science with mainstream political science.⁵ The *Encyclopedia of Critical Political Science* questions the claim that the existing *official* journals (profession) represent the “mainstream” discipline in terms of the methodo-

logical, theoretical, or content orientation of most political scientists (Kasza 2005, 2010; Pion-Berlin and Cleary 2005).

In fact, the persistent and chronic criticism of the official journals by members of the political science discipline exemplifies the distance between the official profession and the mainstream discipline, if we identify the “mainstream” discipline with the intellectual orientations and methodological practices of most living political scientists. Even an APSA Task Force on *Political Science in the 21st Century* (2011, 1) recognized that:

Political science is often ill-equipped to address in a sustained way, why many of the most marginal members of political communities around the world are often unable to have their needs effectively addressed by governments. Just as importantly, political science is also ill-equipped to develop explanations for the social, political, and economic processes that lead to groups' marginalization. This limits the extent to which political science is relevant to broader social and political discourse ... issues related to marginalization including race, gender, and inequality are not well represented in articles published in the discipline's flagship journals.”

This observation is reminiscent of the same concerns that led to the establishment of the CCPS in 1967 and, thus, one must seriously question whether the official political science profession has evolved at all in the last 60 years even if the profession is now more demographically diverse. Indeed, the 21st Century Task Force (2011, 1) concluded that a key reason for these continuing disciplinary lacunae is that “political science tends not to be self-reflective about the analytical limitations of many of its traditional methodological approaches. The tendency to accept its approaches as ‘objective’ science, for example, tend to inhibit the development of a more critical debate about the potential phenomenological bases of much empirical social science.” Such a report should draw our attention to the fact that “official” political science and its governing elite is too often confused with the “mainstream” discipline, which at last report consisted of 11,891 individual members in the United States and abroad (APSA 2023a). We have allowed professional elites to conflate the official profession with the mainstream discipline for far too long, when in fact the official profession

is not the mainstream of the discipline as it is actually practiced by most political scientists.

The Caucus for a New Political Science challenged this myth when it was founded in 1967. It effectively became the first organized section of the APSA in 1969 with its own panels at APSA conventions. Since that time, the APSA (2023b) has authorized 51 Organized Sections that have a cumulative membership of 23,263. The Organized Sections alone publish 20 official journals that in various ways compete with the flagship publications of the APSA. The proliferation of these “organized sections” has largely emerged from the growing interest among political scientists in interdisciplinary, subfield, and methodological research that usually falls outside the official profession and cannot find an adequate outlet in the official panels of the APSA or in the official journals. In fact, the combined membership of the APSA’s Organized Sections is now twice as large as the nominal membership of the official profession, which is a prerequisite for gaining access to the Organized Sections.

The dominant paradigms of official political science are certainly reproduced in the Association’s flagship journal, and in most of the regional association journals, but these journals do not any longer define the discipline of political science (Schram 2003). Indeed, the APSA has been almost helpless to stop the proliferation of critical political science, which flourishes in the publication of alternative journals and through alternative scholarly conferences and professional associations, including the Caucus for a Critical Political Science, Union of Radical Political Economics, Socialist Scholars Conference, Rethinking Marxism Conference, and the Historical Materialism Conference, among many others, which collectively generate more attendance than the annual meetings of the APSA.

The proponents of this critical challenge to the official profession include a diverse array of political scientists, including those that might be called disenchanted liberals and critical pluralists to Marxian socialists, and everything in between those two poles. In other words, the critical challenge to official political science has included almost everyone and anything that is not positivist, as well as anyone and everything that is to the ideological left of mainstream liberalism as enunciated and practiced by the U.S.

Democratic Party. Thus, it would be foolhardy to try and identify a “paradigm” or a “theory” of critical political science, but this does not mean that one cannot find something like Ludwig Wittgenstein’s (1968) “family resemblances.” Critical political science is akin to a language family, or even a Venn diagram, where methods, theories, concepts, journals, and scholars are interconnected by a series of overlapping similarities, but where no one commonality is shared by everyone who would call themselves a critical political scientist. Critical political science is methodologically eclectic, theoretically pluralistic, and conceptually diverse and, yet, it manages to hang together as a critique of how official political science is performed through its journals and conferences.

Indeed, when the Caucus for a Critical Political Science was founded in 1967, it already included political scientists of many diverse viewpoints, but it was united by a philosophical and methodological critique of behavioralism, an empirical critique of pluralist theory, and an ideological critique of the relationship between political science and the state. By 1979, after a decade of organizational insurgency and conflict with the APSA, these strands of thought fused into a full-blown critique of capitalist society and an explicit commitment to a socialist-feminist politics (Barrow 2017). Thus, critical political science finds its most recent intellectual origins in a critique of the systems analytic-pluralist paradigm that came to dominate official political science in the 1950 and 1960s,⁶ but which by 1968 was singularly incapable of explaining how a student revolt, the civil rights movement, the anti-nuclear movement, and the anti-war movement all erupted at the very moment when official political scientists were smugly declaring “the end of ideology” (Bell 1960). These movements collectively disrupted the system equilibrium posited by systems analysts and they challenged the theoretical claim that the United States (and Western Europe) had achieved a peaceful class compromise on managed capitalism and the Keynesian welfare state (Singer 1970; Touraine 1971; Young 1977).

The first wave of critical scholarship emerged in the late 1950s through the 1960s as a challenge to the major empirical claims of pluralist theory, although this scholarship continued to work through the questions,

concepts, and methods of pluralist theory. As Mark Kesselman (1982b, 86) observes, during this time:

Scholars demonstrated that inequalities of power and income within the United States were extensive, cumulative, and persistent; political officials were recruited from a narrow social and economic group and did not accurately represent the interests of the poor; the political system institutionalized racial and economic inequality, producing systematic biases in the operation of pluralism; nondecisions and abuses of power by political authorities severely narrowed the range of political alternatives; and concentrations of private power limited American democracy.

These critiques offered empirical documentation of continuing economic and political inequality in the United States, while calling attention to the increasingly visible disequilibrium and dysfunctions within Western and worldwide political systems. This critique emerged in a straight line from Floyd Hunter's *Community Power Structure* (1953), C. Wright Mills's, *The Power Elite* (1956), G. William Domhoff's, *Who Rules America?* (1967) to Ralph Miliband's, *The State in Capitalist Society* (1969). Numerous other scholars contributed to the development of this critique, including E.E. Schattschneider, Christian Bay, Henry Kariel, William E. Connolly, Peter Bachrach and Morton Baratz, Murray Edelman, Matthew Crenson, Michael Parenti, and Joseph Peschek among others but, as Kesselman (1982a) describes it, critical political science quickly traveled the road from a critique of "apologetic pluralism to Marxism."

At the end of this road, Ralph Miliband suggested that "capitalism" and "the state" must be central concepts of a critical political science. Miliband (1969, 2, 3) observed that "a theory of the state is also a theory of society and of the distribution of power in that society," whereas pluralist assumptions tended "to exclude, by definition, the notion that the state might be a rather special institution, whose main purpose is to defend the predominance in society of a particular class." From this perspective, the maintenance of system equilibrium by the political institutions in capitalist societies is in fact the maintenance of economic and political inequality and, therefore, the economic exploita-

tion and political oppression of the working class and other marginalized or subordinate social groups.

The critique of pluralism and systems analysis as the hegemonic paradigm in political science increasingly came into focus as a political program starting with the student revolt, which challenged the increasingly corporate university by seizing control of administration buildings and by chasing military and C.I.A. recruiters off their campuses.⁷ The student movement gradually linked up with the civils rights movement and this alliance became a cornerstone of the anti-Vietnam War movement. The civil rights movement, especially the Freedom Summer (1964) and a surge in urban (black) riots in cities across the United States made the (capitalist) system's purported equilibrium look increasingly suspect. Moreover, inside the social sciences, events transpired to pull back the profession's veil of feigned scientific objectivity and political neutrality, including Project Camelot, Henry Kissinger's and Samuel P. Huntington's role in the Vietnam War, and the Evron Kirkpatrick affair, which exposed linkages between the C.I.A. and the American Political Science Association. Behind the scenes, official political scientists were actively deploying their new science for the purpose of delegitimizing democratic movements at home and forcibly suppressing peasants' and workers' revolutions abroad. In fact, by the mid-1970s, official political science concluded that there was a "crisis of democracy" and that the crisis consisted of too much democracy and not enough capitalism (Crozier, Huntington, and Watanuki 1975).

Thus, by the late 1960s and early 1970s, critical scholars began to abandon the last vestiges of the pluralist approach, even in its more critical forms, to build out this same critique from an explicitly Marxist perspective. The conclusions drawn from the critique of pluralism became the new starting point for the development and articulation of an alternative theoretical framework, which more often than not was Marxism, although there were some critical political scientists who began to experiment with Freudian Psychoanalysis (Wolfenstein 1969, 1993), Phenomenology (Surkin 1970), and Critical Theory (Arato and Ebbhardt 1978). During this time, Kesselman (1982b, 116) further points out that "Marxist political studies were born from a collision

between realities in the United States and elsewhere – imperialism, inequality, repression, racism, and sexism – and the myths of pluralist democracy and incrementalism purveyed in American government textbooks and scholarly research by the major figures in American political science.” However, in referencing “Marxism” as an alternative theoretical framework, it should be noted that this *Encyclopedia* includes essays on ten different types of Marxism, as well as multiple theories of imperialism, dependency, and empire, so it would be a mistake to assume that Marxism was ever a monolithic or orthodox paradigm within critical political science.

Instead, the critique of pluralism emerged in multiple strands of criticism from disenchanted liberals to Marxists, and these critiques were first collected and summarized in a book edited by Charles A. McCoy (Lehigh University) and John Playford (Monash University), entitled *Apolitical Politics: A Critique of Behavioralism* (1967). This book pulled together several previously published essays by Christian Bay, James Petras, Peter Bachrach and Morton Baratz, Todd Gitlin, Steven Lukes, and many others. The book was published just prior to the founding of the CNPS, and its critique of behavioralist methodology and pluralist theory became an intellectual rallying point for critical political scientists, who embraced the book as an early manifesto of critical political science (Ehrenberg 1999, 503).

For both intellectual and political reasons, the critiques in *Apolitical Politics* could not be easily dismissed by behavioralists in the academic establishment. The editors (1967, 3) of *Apolitical Politics* did not reject the scientific study of politics, as did the Straussians, but instead agreed with behavioralists that too many American political scientists had “been unduly preoccupied with the philosophic, legalistic, or descriptive treatment of political institutions.” The contributors to *Apolitical Politics* believed that behavioralism had a great deal to contribute to political science through its rigorous application of scientific method, its insistence on the importance of theory-building, and its willingness to draw on findings from other disciplines, such as sociology, psychology, and economics. However, they also pointed out that the contemporary generation of behavioralists had become methodological extremists, who made unsupportable and dogmatic claims that

went far beyond the aspirations of behavioralism’s founders, such as Charles Merriam, V.O. Key, and Harold Lasswell.⁸ The contemporary generation of behavioralists, while invoking these names, systematically ignored the caveats of those same scholars, particularly their explicit normative commitment to improving democracy.

Charles E. Merriam (1925, 130), who is often considered the founder of the behavioral movement, observed that the application of statistical measurement to political behavior and governmental processes was “one of the great opportunities of modern political science, especially in the United States,” but he also acknowledged “fundamental problems regarding the possibilities and limitations of quantitative method in dealing with social phenomena.” Consequently, Merriam concludes “it is not to be assumed that the quantitative study of government will supersede analysis of other types, either now or perhaps at any time.”⁹ Harold Lasswell (1951, 4) also stressed the need for using “appropriate” quantitative methodologies, but as supplements to historical, institutional, and philosophical approaches, which in combination would produce “authentic information and responsible interpretations” of the policy process.

Lasswell (1951, 8, 15) was very clear that while “one significant feature” of the development of the policy sciences was its use of:

“careful observation, measurement, and record making, quantification is relegated to a relatively secondary position. The richness of the context in the study of interpersonal relations is such that it can be expressed only in part in quantitative terms ... The policy frame of reference makes it necessary to take into account the entire context of significant events (past, present, and prospective) ... and puts the techniques of quantification in a respected but subordinate place.”

Moreover, in contrast to most contemporary behavioralists, who looked to psychology as the model social science, Lasswell (1951, 9) argued that Keynesian economics was “a remarkable example of the creative results which may follow, not when new quantifications are made, but when new models of institutional processes are devised, models which can unify quantitative and nonquantitative observations and point the way to new

empirical, theoretical, and policy activities.” This type of interdisciplinary, mixed methods would allow the social sciences to become “the policy sciences of democracy” (Lasswell 1951, 9; Torgerson 1985).

Establishment behavioralists often invoked the names of Merriam and Lasswell as forebears of the behavioral revolution, but the reality is that neither of these founding fathers suggested that political scientists should rely exclusively on quantitative data and quantitative analysis, nor did they argue that empirical research was confined to the highly statistical techniques and models that now make many social science journals look more like textbooks in advanced mathematics than political science. Merriam and Lasswell always reminded readers that “qualitative” data of the sort that can be collected through key informant interviews, focus groups, content analysis, reviewing government documents and legislative proceedings, judicial decisions, foundation reports, government statistics, and even journalistic accounts of policy formation are all “empirical” forms of observation and data collection. Heinz Eulau (1963, vii) and others, despite acknowledging Lasswell as “a continuing source of stimulation” were ignoring Lasswell’s caveat about appropriate quantification and methodological pluralism. It was in this respect that “new” political science was reasserting itself as the heir to a long tradition of *reform* political science (Seidelman 1985; Gunnell 2006).

Similarly, as McCoy and Playford (1967, 10) also pointed out, the late V.O. Key, “while regarded by many as a behavioralist, never allowed himself to be dominated by his methodology. In fact, his greatness becomes apparent precisely where he leaves the narrow confines of his empirical data.” For example, Key (1960, 24) wrote that “the invention of the sample survey gave the study of politics a powerful observational instrument. Yet it is a tool singularly difficult to bring to bear upon significant questions of politics.” In this sense, critical political science was reaffirming Lasswell’s call for a political science that was empirical, applied, and normative in the sense that Lasswell expected policy scientists to conduct research that was not only immediately useful to decision-makers, but that would support and sustain democratic government by assisting public officials and citizens in being informed and effective in performing their responsibilities. McCoy and

Playford (1967, 11) agreed with Lasswell that “real knowledge of the political world is practical knowledge” and, therefore, “political research must address itself to real problems in their real settings, even if this involves a sacrifice of methodological precision ... political science must be political as well as scientific.” Similarly, Christian Bay (1970, xvi), a co-founder of the Caucus for a New Political Science decried the current state of the political science discipline as making:

no sense at all, with neo-Aristotelian philosophers [i.e., Straussians] disdainful of empirical inquiry on one side of the gulf, confronted with logical positivist behavioralists who shy away from any and all normative commitments on the other side. To make matters worse, communications across the chasm at times suggest the existence of two enemy camps, not two kinds of scholars with complementary contributions to make toward a common objective.

Thus, it is necessary to correct the widespread misconception that CCPS and critical political science was methodologically anti-empirical and anti-quantitative. The CCPS and critical political scientists have often been dismissed as a group of discontented political philosophers, who were rallying behind the Straussians’ anti-behavioral/anti-empirical critique of contemporary political science.¹⁰ However, as Bay’s statement makes clear, this was never the case as those speaking on behalf of the Caucus were as anti-Straussian as they were anti-behavioral. Their critiques were directed at what Somit and Tanenhaus had called “behavioral extremists” of the sort represented by Heinz Eulau, Austin Ranney, and Nelson Polsby, who were steadily capturing leadership of the discipline in the 1960s and afterwards despite more measured voices.

In fact, most CCPS members, including its leadership were specialists in American Government and Politics, Public Policy, International Relations, and Comparative Politics with its membership spanning the breadth of the discipline’s subfields, such as Michael Parenti, Sanford Schram, James Petras, and Mark Kesselman, respectively.¹¹ Most of the essays in *Apolitical Politics* are not about political philosophy, but empirical, historical, and institutional critiques of behavioral and pluralist research in American politics, comparative politics, and interna-

tional relations. Dwight Waldo (1975, 115) points out that many of the early CCPS activists had sophisticated statistical skills for the time, but “in a formal sense, the positions argued by the Caucus members often were those of the traditionalists (e.g., the importance of values, a loose, as against a strict interpretation of science).”¹²

David Easton (1969, 1051), the high priest of the behavioral revolution in political science, responded to critical political scientists in his 1969 APSA presidential address and he surprised the Behavioral Establishment by echoing many of the concerns expressed by them. Easton declared:

A new revolution is under way in American political science. The last revolution – behavioralism – has scarcely been completed before it has been overtaken by the increasing social and political crises of our time. The weight of these crises is being felt within our discipline in the form of a new conflict in the throes of which we now find ourselves. This new and latent challenge is directed against a developing behavioral orthodoxy ... The initial impulse of this revolution is just being felt. Its battle cries are relevance and action.

A year after Easton announced the post-behavioral revolution, the Caucus for a New Political Science published a second book, entitled *An End to Political Science: The Caucus Papers* (1970), which was a collection of essays by newly prominent members of the CNPS that proclaimed the end of political science as it was currently practiced in the United States. Marvin Surkin and Alan Wolfe (1970, 5) proclaimed that:

To change political science will require a critique of the current [behavioral-pluralist] paradigm and the development of alternative modes of research, theory, and social practice. The only way this is possible is by ending the hegemony of political science over its students ... In short, because the only political science permitted in America today is that defined and determined within the existing paradigm, and because only those “responsible” critics who are content to remain within the established pluralistic mold are tolerated, we conclude that the only option now available to critics and reformers is an end to political science.

These proclamations set the stage for a new wave of post-behavioral methodologies and

theories that began to emerge in the 1970s and 1980s. While much of critical political science is anchored in Marxist political economy, class analysis, and a theory of the capitalist state, by the mid-1980s, critical political science had increasingly embraced various strands of feminism, post-structuralism, post-modernism, ecology, and LGBTQ politics, which evolved into an increasingly intersectional and multi-dimensional understanding of capitalism, power, and the state. This entailed a recognition of post-Marxist claims that political power is not always exercised through decisions and actions, but is often embedded within, and reproduced through, a multiplicity of non-state and non-institutional social forms, including language, leisure, cultural artifacts and symbols, mass media, and inter-personal relations, to name a few.

Consequently, in addition to developing a critique of liberal democracy and the capitalist state, critical political scientists have studiously attempted to rethink the categories of the liberal-democratic republic, as institutionalized in capitalist societies, by re-examining the concept of “democracy” itself. These efforts to re-examine the theory and practice of democracy seek to extend its applicability, and deepen its practice, to include various forms of economic democracy, deliberative democracy, populist democracy, radical and participatory democracy, and digital democracy, among others. Critical political science emphasizes that “democracy” does not have to be confined to the narrow institutional limits (e.g., periodic elections) currently allowed in capitalist societies.

Yet, any attempt to expand the theoretical meaning and political practice of democracy requires that critical political scientists reassess various forms of political struggle and this has led to a renewed focus today on questions of political strategy (Knox 2012; Barrow 2019; Barrow 2023) and political tactics (Barrow 2022; Blackledge 2019). Beyond the narrow sphere of political campaigns and elections, critical political scientists have sought to renew interest in alternative non-electoral forms of political struggle such as mutual aid, direct action, diversity of tactics, social movements, the general strike, the mass strike, and even community armed self-defense (as a tactic of last resort). Thus, what one will not see in the *ECPS* are the normal categories of official

political science, such as political parties, elections and campaigns, representation, legislatures and Congress, the U.S. Presidency, and the U.S. Supreme Court, which are to put it bluntly the categories of bourgeois republicanism and bourgeois social science.

From this perspective, the concept of politics opens up onto a wide panoply of alternative ways of studying politics. One can find politics, power, oppression, and emancipation in cultural forms such as art (Macdonald 1999; Mattern and Love 2013, Mattern 2016), music (Mattern 1998; Love 2006, 2016), literature (Williams 1977), film (Kiersey and Neumann 2013), and television (Gonzalez 2019). It is no accident that the subtitle of *New Political Science*, the flagship journal of the Caucus for a Critical Political Science, has always been a “journal of politics and culture.” It was an explicit signal that critical political science intended to widen the boundaries of political science and to recognize that power, ideology, and political conflict are embedded in society and culture and not just exercised through a state apparatus. These diverse strands of thought have never fused into a single over-arching theoretical perspective – nor is it expected that they will ever do so – but there is a great deal of borrowing and lending of methods and concepts among these strands of thought that create what the pluralists would call “cross-cutting cleavages,” which both unite and divide critical political scientists across a multiplicity of axes.¹³ Critical political science is now akin to a mosaic or a patchwork quilt, where the individual pieces might or might not stand on their own, but where the final product is greater than a mere sum of its parts.

Yet, it is also important to emphasize that while critical political scientists have never subscribed to the most extreme versions of Behavioralism, or to positivist philosophy, neither do most of them embrace the anti-empiricist, anti-behavioralist, and subjectivist epistemology that came to define large swaths of the Post-Modernist turn in the social sciences and humanities. Critical political scientists have always called for a measured and reasonable form of methodological pluralism and mixed methods approaches to political science. It insists that there is not a single definitive “scientific method” in political science, but a plurality of methods and approaches that can offer insights into political conflict, and knowledge about social

power and the state. There is a multiplicity of ways to generate *different kinds of knowledge* about politics and power.

Yet, it is also important to emphasize that critical political science has not generally embraced the most extreme versions of post-modernist non-intersectional identity politics, which is nothing more than a contemporary variant of the old pluralism and post-1960s Democratic Party “liberalism,” even though it performs itself as a certain type of cultural “radicalism.” In the United States, as in most countries of the world, critical political scientists would mostly agree that is not possible to undertake an *empirical or historical analysis* of class, culture, or political economy without incorporating factors such as race, ethnicity, gender, religion, geographic location, and citizenship status into our understanding of class formation and intra-class hierarchies. It is also not possible to undertake a realistic empirical or historical analysis of these “identities” without also incorporating class into the analysis. Consequently, critical political science promotes and facilitates a constructive engagement between Marxism, Feminism, Critical Race Theory, Post-Marxism, Post-Modernism, Post-Structuralism, and other forms of analysis to unravel the complexities of power, domination, exploitation, and oppression. Anyone who would assert the exclusive hegemonic prerogatives of a single method or theory within critical political science is *not* a critical political scientist, but an ideologue and a methodological dogmatist. The emphasis of critical political science must always be on “the critical” and this includes self-criticism and an openness to mutual criticism within its ranks. Equally important is that critical political scientists are also willing to *engage the official discipline* – to be critical and to be criticized by others – rather than isolating one’s self in the security of a self-validating, solipsistic, intellectual silo.

The entries in the *Encyclopedia of Critical of Political Science*, and the authors of those entries convey an image of the political science discipline, which harkens back to its origins when political science was often called the political sciences (Smith 1886). As discussed in the Preface to *ECPS*, the biographical entries include individuals that the official discipline would exclude from political science because they are nominally

classified as economists, sociologists, historians, literary critics, anthropologists, philosophers, and so on. Even the individuals formally affiliated with departments of political science employ a variety of methodological approaches, draw on theories and concepts from other disciplines, and write on topics as diverse as art, music, film, ideology, social movements, the state, poverty, and public policy, to name a few.

What official political science does not study

More than a decade after Easton's declaration of the post-behavioral revolution, Charles Lindblom (1982), the APSA President acknowledged that despite the official discipline's on-going pretensions to being a science in the same mold as physics, official political science had continued churning out trivial findings that merely reaffirmed what we already knew about politics and government. Lindblom chastised official political scientists for their "amateur" definition of problems and even asked why they continue to naively assume that government serves the common good, rather than the interests of an economic and political elite, when a wealth of empirical data and critical political science proved the latter? Why did political scientists define political socialization as education instead of as ideological mystification, reification, and indoctrination that legitimates the interests of a dominant elite? Most importantly, why did Establishment pluralism still so willingly accept citizen apathy as a source of political stability instead of as a failure to build a vibrant democracy? Instead of voting behavior, why not study non-voting and alienation among citizens (e.g., Hirsch 1971; Hirsch and Gutierrez 1977)? These were obvious questions, and the answers were often already in plain sight, as the previous critiques of pluralism had demonstrated, but the official profession's hegemonic methodological lens was a blinder that suppressed critical facts about liberal capitalist democracies. Twelve years later, Theodore J. Lowi (1994) again drew attention to the continuing absence of the state in political science while also serving as President of the American Political Science Association. However, these warnings from within the profession's elite were also dismissed and they had little impact on official political science.

Indeed, another decade after Lowi's admonition to the discipline, Bertell Ollman (2000, 554) could rightly observe that official political science was still preoccupied with the question of "how to study" political science instead of "what to study." By this time, the dominant paradigm was shifting from behavioralism to rational choice theory and formal modeling, but the underlying positivist philosophy of science remained unchanged despite Easton's earlier assault on the Political Science Establishment. However, Ollman (2000, 555) added that rational choice theory and formal modeling, which were beginning to displace the old behavioralism "carries the miniaturization of political science one step further by dismissing what people actually do politically and concentrating on their decisions to do it, on the calculations involved (or supposedly involved, or, for some scholars, ideally involved) in making choices."

Moreover, Ollman concluded that the main problem with official political science was not what it studied, but what it did not study, because it seemed that all the most interesting and important questions that might be the focus of political science were either not amenable to "scientific" investigation or they were outside the discipline's boundaries. The objects of study in political science were still method driven, which meant the scope of political science was increasingly narrowed to those things that were susceptible to quantification, that is, elections, public opinion, and elite decision-making. Yet, according to Ollman (2000, 561), the most significant lacuna in official political science was still "the absence of capitalism from political science." The *assumption* by official political scientists was that political institutions were neutral arbiters of group conflict within an autonomous "political system." This *a priori* analytical assumption allowed political science to assume that the state is "a set of institutions independent of the capitalist class and, therefore, more or less available to any group that organizes itself effectively to use it." This means that despite all evidence to the contrary, political scientists continue "to treat our society as a democracy made up of individual citizens rather than a dictatorship of the capitalist class, albeit one with democratic trimmings" (Ollman 2000, 561). Ollman (2000, 561) concluded that these methodological and conceptual blinders ensured that political science would study-

ously avoid capitalism and, thereby, trivialize or evade the non-democratic premises and practices of liberal capitalist “democracies.”

Thus, one of the most important foci of critical political science has been its commitment to foregrounding what official political science does not study. Official political science does not study the working class, nor does it study women, African-Americans, Chicanos/Latinos, or ecologists. When official political science responded to the critiques of critical political scientists, official political science did so by integrating these groups into the behavioral-pluralist paradigm to study them merely as interest groups or voting blocs, but of course it never examined the underlying structures of group identity, nor asked why these groups came into being as political actors. Official political science did not study “labor” or “the working class,” but it did look at the small number of workers organized into trade unions as just another pluralist interest group. It will still not entertain the question of whether the class structure of capitalism is based on the exploitation of labor and the extraction of surplus value (evidently a question for economists to sort out). Consequently, official political science will not even broach the question of “class struggle,” except as something to be contained by political institutions, because it otherwise disturbs the functional equilibrium of the political system. Official political science did not study how political institutions and public policies contribute to the problems of poverty and inequality, because such concerns were the province of sociology and economics. Official political science did not study ecology, but when it finally did turn its attention to environmental issues, it did so again through the lens of interest group politics, but with little notice of the fact that environmental politics and the ecology movement emerged as a response to the devastating impact of capitalist economic development on the planet and the human ecosphere (Crenson 1971; Lukes 1974).

Moreover, despite the profession’s concerted efforts over the last decade to demonstrate its “relevance” to solving social and political problems, and to being more methodologically and demographically diverse, those efforts merely advertise its long-standing ties to corporate capitalism and the state (APSA 2014; Lupia and Aldrich 2015). Indeed, in contemplating the question

of political science in the twenty-first century, a recent APSA taskforce report (2011, 13, 4) acknowledges that political scientists still treat race, ethnicity, and gender “as marginal aspects of the political system,” while textbooks are not “representative of issues related to ethnic, racial, gender, class, and other dimensions of diversity and inclusion” (e.g., Sclofsky and Funk 2018; Funk and Sclofsky 2021). The report (2011, 1) observes that this is perhaps not surprising insofar as the political science profession, as represented in most university departments “does not currently include scholars with backgrounds from the full range of positionalities including race, class, gender, and sexual orientation that are often the most marginalized in societies.”

There is another blind spot in the positivist-behavioral orientation of official political science and that problem is highlighted in the 1979 CNPS declaration that its goal was “to make the study of politics relevant to the struggle for a better world.” Critical political scientists are engaged scholars, scholar-activists, and sometimes activist-scholars. As mentioned earlier, they reject the myth of value neutrality in the social sciences insofar as one should not confuse scientific objectivity with political neutrality. A scholar may conduct rigorous and objective scientific studies of their topic, but this does not mean that the results of their studies, nor the original selection of questions, is politically neutral. Critical political scientists refuse to ignore the fact that all social scientific knowledge is anchored in ideological assumptions (Mannheim 1936) that themselves can be subjected to scrutiny and critique by self-reflective scholarship (Habermas 1971). Thus, a critical scholar cannot be indifferent to the social and political impact of their science or pretend that because one pursues knowledge for its own sake that it does not have potential consequences beyond the journal that publishes it.

However, as exemplified by Easton, the positivists and behavioralists drew a sharp distinction between “pure science” and “applied science.” Easton claimed that applied (policy) science depends on (builds on) pure scientific research, so he was very clear in his own work that political scientists should not adopt “the policy orientation” being proposed by Harold Lasswell at the same time. Easton (1965, Chap. 1) is very clear about claiming that a scientific

explanation and understanding of political behavior must logically precede the solution of urgent practical problems in society. The gist of Easton's argument was that political scientists had not yet built up a sufficient storehouse of verified scientific propositions (general theory) to justify their intrusion into the policy domain. Thus, Easton was prepared to let policy-makers muddle through on their own, but for how long (Lindblom 1959)? This question was answered more than fifty years later with the release of the APSA's task force report on *American Democracy in an Age of Rising Inequality* (2004).

Frances Fox Piven (2006, 45), a long-time member of the CCPS and former President of the American Sociological Association called the report a good "first step," but she also criticized it for being "timid" in its conclusions and policy recommendations. As Brian Waddell (2012, 339), another CCPS member observed, the Task Force report "lacked any serious consideration of why inequality has accelerated in recent decades" and it "seems to consciously evade the question of corporate power, and the ways that business and government interact as two interrelated systems of power." As Waddell notes, theoretical explanations, as opposed to mere empirical description, would necessarily involve a critical examination of the public policies adopted and implemented since the beginning of the Reagan Revolution, which facilitated the growth of economic and class inequality in the United States.

The irate response by Jacob S. Hacker, a member of the Task Force, was that "If members of the Task Force were 'timid' ... we were only in the appropriate sense that we were restrained by the limited state of current knowledge." Hacker (2006, 45) claimed that "the ongoing refinement, and sometimes replacement, of theories and concepts rooted in sustained lines of empirical inquiry ultimately drives the social sciences forward." Consequently, Hacker (2006, 48–9) pointed to the alleged "need for new research and new theories and, yes, new debates." Twelve years later, a new APSA Task Force on Racial and Class Inequalities in the Americas (2016) could still claim accurately that "to some extent, political science has lagged behind cognate fields of history, economics and sociology in terms of scholarly attentiveness to inequality."

So exactly when do we know enough as political scientists to become policy advocates and engaged scholars? The philosophy of science that undergirds official political science provides a ready-made excuse for never tackling big or difficult issues, because conclusions and recommendations must always be postponed while political scientists "test" yet more hypotheses of limited or trivial importance, or wait on the results of the next "field experiment" (assuming the results have not been fabricated). The commitment to a specific definition of "science" has merely been a pretext to avoid politics – an excuse for political scientists to neglect salient issues that raise unsettling questions about the structure of capitalist society, as well as the non-democratic and even anti-democratic aspects of liberalism, but even worse is that the structure of official political science often obstructs any meaningful discussion of solutions to these problems by reproducing the flight from public policy. Thus, it was somewhat ironic that in 2010–11, when the Editor of this volume was Chair of the CNPS, and the organization was contemplating changing its name to "critical," because it was not "new" anymore, that one of the most persuasive arguments against doing so was that official political science had not substantially changed since 1967 and, therefore, the critical political science critique of the official discipline was effectively just as new now as it was in 1967!

Finally, however, it is important to call attention to the current "political science is relevant" movement within the official discipline. I would be remiss if I did not point out that contrary to many official misconceptions, critical political scientists have not primarily criticized official political science for being irrelevant.¹⁴ Rather, critical political scientists have criticized the profession for *feigning* scientific disinterest and political neutrality, while covertly applying its talents to either ignore pressing social issues, to help suppress marginalized social groups, to sustain the exploitation of working classes around the world, and to legitimate the undemocratic exercise of power by corporate and state elites at home and abroad. Political science has never been irrelevant; but it has been dangerous to ordinary people all over the world. It is exactly for this reason that official political science does not seriously study itself as a profession, or as an intellectual discipline,

nor does it use the tools of political science to study the university as a political actor or as an extension of the state (Barrow 1990). Official disciplinary histories have instead corralled the study of the discipline within the confines of traditional political theory, a marginalized subfield, while dismissing the idea that the university should be studied as a political institution.¹⁵ Thus, the court historians of political science present the development of the discipline as a disembodied dialogue across the ages, albeit over a much shorter time span (150 years), where ideas compete with each other detached from their historical, sociological, and political context and, thus, the “best” ideas necessarily win. These official histories merely reproduce and legitimate the official discipline’s conception of itself as an intellectual meritocracy, when it is in fact a political organization, and an organization heavily influenced by the power and interests of a ruling class and the capitalist state. In that respect, official political science is political ideology, and this *Encyclopedia* is an ideology critique.

Notes

1. Somit and Tanenhaus (1967, 74) claim that “by any standard, Lowell is entitled to rank with Merriam as a progenitor of the ‘new science of politics’ of the 1920s and as intellectual godfather of the current behavioral movement.”
2. Waldo (1975, 48) argues that “under Merriam’s leadership the University of Chicago became noted for a serious and sustained effort to stress the ‘science’ in political science ... and a significant number of the leaders of the later behavioral movement were trained there in the thirties.”
3. Gunnell (2005) dissents from both claims and argues that G.E.G. Catlin and William Yandell Elliott “set the terms of a dialogue that, for three-quarters of a century, would define the discourse of political science.”
4. Roelofs (2015, 348).
5. I am also not suggesting that the “mainstream” of the political science discipline is reducible to “critical political science,” but the two segments overlap to a significant degree. In fact, “the mainstream” of the discipline is highly diverse and fragmented and cannot be identified with any single method, theory, or ideology beyond a common opposition to positivism and scientism.
6. McCoy and Playford (1967, 10) suggest that by the mid-1960s it would “not be unwarranted to speak of the behavioralists as members of an ‘establishment’ within the discipline.” Indeed, Easton (1979, 4, 20) declares the behavioral revolution a *fait accompli* and refers to its practitioners as a “concrete academic movement” within political science.
7. Steck (2003, 66) defines the corporate university “as an institution that is characterized by processes, decisional criteria, expectations, organizational culture, and operating practices that are taken from, and have their origins in, the modern business corporation.”
8. Connolly (1967, 5) states “We accept, in short, the scientific ideal of political inquiry.” Surkin and Wolfe (1970, 4) also note that “many members of the CNPS employed behavioral techniques and considered themselves ‘behavioralists’.”
9. Similarly, Simon (1985).
10. For instance, Landau (1972, 6, 13), which otherwise offers a sophisticated rebuttal to the CNPS manifestos, claims that the positions articulated by McCoy and Playford and the Straussians “often merge, as a reading of both the Storing and the McCoy-Playford volumes reveals.”
11. Political Philosophy and Theory is overrepresented in CCPS membership and Comparative Politics underrepresented, compared to the APSA, where 11.3 percent of all members identify with Political Philosophy and Theory and 29.3 percent identify as Comparative Politics. Otherwise, CCPS subfield membership closely parallels that of the discipline as a whole. In 2022, the distribution of CCPS membership was Political Philosophy and Theory (39.5 percent), American Politics (24.1 percent), Comparative Politics (13.1 percent), International Relations (11.8 percent), Public Policy (5.7 percent), Public Law (3.8 percent), Public Administration (0.8 percent), and Methodology (1.1 percent), see, American Political Science Association > RESOURCES > Data on the Profession > Dashboard > Membership > Organized Sections (apsanet.org).
12. For example, several future CNPS members and sympathizers, including Theodore J. Lowi, Kenneth M. Dolbeare, Edward S. Greenberg, and James Prothro participated in some of the first conferences sponsored by the Social Science Research Council’s new Committee on Legal and Governmental Processes, which replaced its Committee on Political Behavior in 1964, see, Ranney (1968, vii).
13. The concept of cross-cutting cleavages was originally suggested as a mechanism that generates political stability by Simmel (1950). The basic idea is that no one group can organize all of its members into a single, uniform “ideology” or “political platform” because it must appeal to members of the other groups, who are simultaneously members of other groups, but who have different values and interests on particular issues. One of the best discussions of this stabilizing process is found in Lipset (1960).
14. Of course, this too warranted an APSA, *Report of the Task Force on Improving Public Perceptions of Political Science’s Value* (Washington, DC: American Political Science Association, 2014).
15. In contrast, see Barrow (1990); Schram (2016), Wilson and Kamola (2021); Hauptmann (2022) are notable exceptions to this tendency.

References

- Adcock, Robert. 2014. “A Disciplinary History of Disciplinary Histories: The Case of Political Science.” In *A Historiography of the Modern Social Sciences*, edited by Roger E. Blackhouse

- and Philippe Fontaine, 211–36. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- American Political Science Association. 2004. *Task Force on Inequality and American Democracy, American Democracy in an Age of Rising Inequality*. Washington, D.C.
- American Political Science Association. 2011. *Task Force for Political Science for the 21st Century*. Washington, D.C. Available at [TF_21st_Century_AllPgs_webres90.pdf](#) (apsanet.org).
- American Political Science Association. 2014. *Report of the Task Force on Improving Public Perceptions of Political Science's Value*. Washington, D.C. Available at [APSA 2014_Task Force Report.pdf](#) (apsanet.org).
- American Political Science Association. 2016. *Task Force on Racial and Class Inequalities in The Americas*. Washington, D.C. Available at: [www.apsanet.org/inequalities](#).
- American Political Science Association. 2023a. "APSA Membership Dashboard." Dataset Generated 02/23. American Political Science Association > RESOURCES > Data on the Profession > Dashboard > Membership (apsanet.org).
- American Political Science Association. 2023b. "Section." Available at Groups – APSA Connect Beta (apsanet.org).
- Arato, Andrew and Eike Gebhardt, eds. 1978. *Essential Frankfurt School Reader*. New York: Urizen Books.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 1990. *Universities and the Capitalist State: Corporate Liberalism and the Reconstruction of American Higher Education, 1894–1928*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 2000. *More Than a Historian: The Political and Economic Thought of Charles A. Beard*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 2017. "The Political and Intellectual Origins of New Political Science." *New Political Science* 39, no. 4 (December): 437–72.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 2019. "Marxist Political Theory, Diversity of Tactics, and the Long Civil War." *New Political Science* 41, no. 4 (December): 622–53.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 2022. "What's in a Name? From New Political Science to Critical Political Science." *New Political Science* 44, no. 1 (March): 3–26.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 2022. "Legal and Illegal Political Tactics in Marxist Political Theory." In *Research Handbook on Law and Marxism*, edited by Paul O'Connell and Umut Özsu, 6–20. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishers, Ltd.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 2023. "Nicos Poulantzas Was a Vital Theorist of Democratic Socialism." *The Jacobin*, January 24. Available at Nicos Poulantzas Was a Vital Theorist of Democratic Socialism (jacobin.com).
- Bay, Christian. 1970. *The Structure of Freedom*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Beard, Charles A. 1913. *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Bell, Daniel. 1960. *The End of Ideology: On the Exhaustion of Political Ideas in the Fifties*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Blackledge, Paul. 2019. "On Strategy and Tactics: Marxism and Electoral Politics." *Science & Society* 83, no. 3 (July): 355–80.
- Caucus for a New Political Science, "Constitution (as Revised Fall 1978)." Copy on file with the author.
- Cohen, Morris R. and Ernst Nagel. 1934. *Introduction to Logic and Scientific Method*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co.
- Connolly, William E. 1967. *Political Science and Ideology*. New York: Atherton Press.
- Crenson, Matthew A. 1971. *The Un-politics of Air Pollution; A Study of Non-Decision-Making in the Cities*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Crick, Bernard. 1959. *The American Science of Politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Crozier, Michel, Samuel Huntington, and Joji Watanuki. 1975. *Crisis of Democracy: Report on the Governability of Democracies to the Trilateral Commission*. New York: New York University Press.
- Dryzek, John S. 2006. "Revolutions without Enemies: Key Transformations in Political Science." *American Political Science Review* 100, no. 4 (November): 487–92.
- Easton, David. 1965. *A Framework for Policy Analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Easton, David. 1969. "The New Revolution in Political Science." *American Political Science Review* 63, no. 4 (December): 1051–61.
- Easton, David, John Gunnell, and Michael B. Stein, eds. 1995. *Regime and Discipline: Democracy and the Development of Political Science*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Ehrenberg, John. 1999. "Commentary: History of the Caucus for a New Political Science." *New Political Science* 21, no. 3 (Fall): 501–07.
- Eulau, Heinz. 1963. *The Behavioral Persuasion in Politics*. New York: Random House.
- Farr, James, John S. Dryzek, and Stephen T. Leonard. 1995. *Political Science in History: Research Programs and Political Traditions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Finifter, Ada W. ed. 1983. *Political Science: The State of the Discipline*. Washington, D.C.: American Political Science Association.
- Finifter, Ada W. ed. 1993. *The State of the Discipline II*. Washington, D.C.: American Political Science Review.

- Funk, Kevin and Sebastian Sclofsky. 2021. "The Liberal Ideology: On Intellectual Pluralism and the Marginalization of Marxism in U.S. Political Science." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 54, no. 3 (June): 593–7.
- Furner Mary O. 2011. *Advocacy and Objectivity: A Crisis in the Professionalization of American Political Science, 1865–1905*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.
- Government of the District of Columbia. 2021. "Certificate of Incorporation: Caucus for a Critical Political Science." Washington, D.C.: Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs, Corporations Division.
- Gonzalez, George A. 2019. *Justice and Popular Culture: Star Trek as Philosophical Text*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Gunnell, John G. 1993. *The Descent of Political Theory: The Genealogy of an American Vocation* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gunnell, John G. 2005. "Political Science on the Cusp: Recovering a Discipline's Past." *American Political Science Review* 99, no. 4 (November): 597–609.
- Gunnell, John. 2006. "The Founding of the American Political Science Association: Discipline, Profession, Political Theory, and Politics." *American Political Science Review* 100, no. 4 (November): 479–86.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1971. *Knowledge and Human Interests*, translated by Jeremy J. Shapiro. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hacker, Jacob S. 2006. "Inequality, American Democracy, and American Political Science: The Need for Cumulative Research." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 39, no. 1: 47–9.
- Hauptmann, Emily. 2022. *Foundations and American Political Science: The Transformation of a Discipline, 1945–1970*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Hempel, Carl G. 1965. *Aspects of Scientific Explanation, and Other Essays in the Philosophy of Science*. New York: Free Press.
- Hirsch, Herbert. 1971. *Poverty and Politicization: Political Socialization in an American Sub-Culture*. New York: Free Press.
- Hirsch, Herbert and Armando Gutierrez. 1977. *Learning to Be Militant: Ethnic Identity and the Development of Political Militance in a Chicano Community*. San Francisco: R&E Research Associates.
- Jameson, Frederic. 1991. *Postmodernism or The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Kasza, Gregory J. 2005. "Methodological Bias in the American Journal of Political Science." In *Perestroika! The Raucous Rebellion in Political Science*, edited by Kirsten Renwick Monroe, 342–5. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kasza, Gregory. 2010. "Perestroika and the Journals." *PS: Politics and Political Science* 43, no. 4: 733–4.
- Katznelson, Ira and Helen V. Milner, eds. 2002. *Political Science: State of the Discipline*. New York: W.W. Norton and Co., Inc.
- Kesselman, Mark. 1982a. "The Conflictual Evolution of American Political Science: From Apologetic Pluralism to Trilateralism and Marxism." In *Public Values and Private Power in American Politics*, edited by J. David Greenstone, 34–67. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kesselman, Mark. 1982b. "The State and Class Struggle: Trends in Marxist Political Studies." In *The Left Academy: Marxist Scholarship on American Campuses*, edited by Bertell Oilman and Edward Vernoff, 82–114.
- Key, Jr., V.O. 1960. "The Politically Relevant in Surveys." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 24, no. 1 (Spring): 54–61.
- Kiersey, Nicholas J. and Iver B. Neumann. 2013. *Battlestar Galactica and International Relations*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Knox, Robert. 2012. "Strategy and Tactics." In *Finnish Yearbook of International Law*, Volume 21, 193–229. Helsinki: Ius Gentium Association.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. 1962. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Landau, Martin. 1972. *Political Theory and Political Science*. New York: Macmillan Co.
- Lasswell, Harold D. 1951. "The Policy Orientation." In *The Policy Sciences: Recent Developments in Scope and Method*, edited by Daniel Lerner and Harold D. Lasswell, 3–15. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Lasswell, Harold D. 2005. *The Future of Political Science*, with a new introduction by Jay Stanley. New Brunswick: AldineTransaction.
- Lindblom, Charles E. 1959. "The Science of 'Muddling Through'." *Public Administration Review* 19, no. 2 (Spring): 79–88.
- Lindblom, Charles. 1982. "Another State of Mind: Presidential Address, APSA 1981." *American Political Science Review* 76, no. 1 (March): 9–21.
- Lipset Seymour Martin. 1960. *Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.
- Love, Nancy Sue. 2006. *Musical Democracy*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Love, Nancy Sue. 2016. *Trendy Fascism: White Power Music and the Future of Democracy*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Lowi, Theodore. 1992. "The State in Political Science: How We Become What We Study." *American Political Science Review* 86, no. 1 (March): 1–7.
- Lowi, Theodore. 2005. "Every Poet His Own Aristotle." In *Perestroika! The Raucous Rebellion in Political Science*, edited by Kirsten Renwick Monroe, 45–52. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Lukes, Steven. 1974. *Power: A Radical View*. London and New York: Macmillan.
- Lupia, Arthur and John. H. Aldrich. 2015. *How Political Science Can Better Communicate Its Value: 12 Recommendations from the APSA Task Force*. Washington, D.C.: American Political Science Association. Available at How Political Science Can Better Communicate Its Value: 12 Recommendations from the APSA Task Force | PS: Political Science & Politics | Cambridge Core.
- Macdonald, Bradley J. 1999. *William Morris and the Aesthetic Constitution of Politics*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Mann, Robert. 2010. *Introduction to Particle Physics and the Standard Model*. Boca Raton: CRC Press.
- Mannheim, Karl. 1936. *Ideology and Utopia*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Jovanovich.
- Mattern, Mark. 1998. *Acting in Concert: Music, Community, and Political Action*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Mattern, Mark. 2016. *Anarchism and Art: Democracy in the Cracks and on the Margins*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Mattern, Mark and Nancy S. Love, eds. 2013. *Doing Democracy: Activist Art and Cultural Politics*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- McCoy, Charles A. and John Playford, eds. 1967. *Apolitical Politics: A Critique of Behavioralism*. New York, NY: Thomas Y. Crowell.
- Merriam, Charles E. 1925. *New Aspects of Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Monroe, Kristen Renwick, ed. 2005. *Perestroika! The Raucous Rebellion in Political Science*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Oerter, Robert. 2006. *Theory of Almost Everything: The Standard Model, The Unsung Triumph of Modern Physics*. New York: Pi Press.
- Ollman, Bertell. 2000. "What is Political Science? What Should It Be?" *New Political Science* 22, no. 4 (December): 553–62.
- Parsons, Talcott. 1951. *The Social System*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Pion-Berlin, David and Dan Cleary. 2005. "Method Bias in the APSR." In *Perestroika! The Raucous Rebellion in Political Science*, edited by Kirsten Renwick Monroe, 304–22. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Piven, Frances Fox. 2006. "Response to 'American Democracy in an Age of Inequality'." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 39, no. 1 (January): 43–6.
- Popper, Karl R. 1959. *Logic of Scientific Discovery*. New York: Basic Books.
- Ranney, Austin, ed. 1968. *Political Science and Public Policy*. Chicago: Markham Publishing Co.
- Roelofs, Joan. 2015. "What is Political Science and What Should It Be?" *International Critical Thought* 5, no. 3: 348–61.
- Ross, Dorothy. 1991. *Origins of American Social Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Salisbury, Robert. 2001. "Current Criticism of APSA is Nothing New." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 34 (December): 767.
- Schram, Sanford. 2003. "Return to Politics: Perestroika and Postparadigmatic Political Science." *Political Theory* 31, no. 6: 835–51.
- Schram, Sanford. 2016. *Neoliberalizing the University: Implications for American Democracy*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Scolofsky, Sebastián and Kevin Funk. 2018. "The Specter That Haunts Political Science: The Neglect and Misreading of Marx in International Relations and Comparative Politics." *International Studies Perspectives* 19, no. 1 (February): 83–101.
- Seidelman, Raymond. 1985. *Disenchanted Realists: Political Science and the American Crisis, 1884–1984*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Seidelman, Raymond. 1990. "Can the History of Political Science Be Neutral?" *American Political Science Review* 84, no. 2 (June): 587–607.
- Seidelman, Raymond. 1993. "Political Scientists, Disenchanted Realists, and Disappearing Democrats." In *Discipline and History: Political Science in the United States*, edited by James Farr and Raymond Seidelman, 311–25. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Simmel, Georg. 1950. *Sociology*, translated, edited, and with an introduction by Kurt H. Wolff. Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1950.
- Simon, Herbert A. 1985. "Charles E. Merriam and the 'Chicago School' of Political Science." Edmund James Lecture, Delivered on October 10, available at <http://digitalcollections.library.cmu.edu/awweb/awarchive?type=file&item=34043>.
- Singer, Daniel. 1970. *Prelude to Revolution: France in May 1968*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Smith, Munroe. 1886. "Introduction: The Domain of Political Science." *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (March): 1–8.
- Somit, Albert and Joseph Tanenhaus. 1967. *The Development of American Political Science*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Steck, Henry. 2003. "Corporatization of the University: Seeking Conceptual Clarity." *Annals of the American Academy of Social and Political Science* 585, no. 1 (January): 66–83.
- Surkin, Marvin. 1970. "Sense and Nonsense in Politics." In *An End to Political Science: The Caucus Papers*, edited by Marvin Surkin and Alan Wolfe, 13–33. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Torgerson, Douglas. 1985. "Contextual Orientation in Policy Analysis: The Contribution of Harold D. Lasswell." *Policy Science* 18: 241–61.
- Touraine, Alain. 1971. *The May Movement*. New York: Random House.
- Waddell, Brian. 2012. "When the Past is Not Prologue: The Wagner Act Debates and the

- Limits of American Political Science.” *New Political Science* 34, no. 3 (September): 338–57.
- Waldo, Dwight. 1975. “Political Science: Tradition, Discipline, Profession, Science, Enterprise.” In *Handbook of Political Science; Political Science: Scope and Theory*, Vol. 1, edited by Fred I. Greenstein and Nelson Polsby, 1–130. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Weber, Max. 1949. *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*, translated by Edward A. Shils and Henry A. Finch. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Williams, Raymond. 1977. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilson, Ralph. 2021. *Free Speech and Koch Money: Manufacturing a Campus Culture War*. London: Pluto Press.
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1968. *Philosophical Investigations*, translated by G.E.M. Anscombe. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Wolfenstein, E. Victor. 1969. *Personality and Politics*. Belmont, CA: Dickenson.
- Wolfenstein, E. Victor. 1993. *Psychoanalytic-Marxism: Groundwork*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Young, Nigel. 1977. *An Infantile Disorder? The Crisis and Decline of the New Left*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

PART I

THEORY, METHOD, AND CRITIQUE

1. Critique of pluralism

The behavioral revolution in political science advanced in the United States largely under the aegis of systems analysis and pluralist theory. Talcott Parsons (1951, 75, 126–7), who brought systems analysis into the social sciences, identified “the political system” with individual and collective behaviors that provide a center of integration for all aspects of the social system. David Easton (1952, 106), who played a major role in initiating the behavioral revolution in political science, rejected the fundamental concepts of earlier political scientists by declaring that “neither the state nor power is a concept that serves to bring together political research.” In urging political scientists to abandon the analysis of state and power, Easton (1952, 106) called on scholars to adopt the concept of political systems defined as “those interactions through which values are authoritatively allocated for a society.” The central focus of such an analysis was to understand how political “decision-making” (i.e., authoritative allocations of values) function to reproduce social systems in a state of dynamic equilibrium. By 1970, Michael Parenti (1970, 112) could accurately observe that pluralism was “the new orthodoxy of American political science.”

The critique of pluralism was a key debate in the emergence of critical political science in the 1960s and it was also a focus for challenging the operationalization of behavioral methodology by leading political scientists. Behavioralism is ostensibly an empirical methodology, but its applications in pluralist analysis have consistently revealed its “intellectual and political incapacity to come to terms” with documented facts about American society, government, and politics (Surkin 1970, 13). Critical political scientists have put forward three types of critiques of pluralist theory: immanent critiques, conceptual critiques, and the elaboration of theoretical alternatives to pluralism (e.g., Marxist class analysis).

Immanent critique

Parenti (1970, 137) was one of the first scholars to offer an immanent critique of pluralist theory by focusing primarily on Robert Dahl’s *Who Governs?* (1961), which had

analysed municipal decision-making in the city of New Haven, Connecticut during the 1950s. Parenti focused on this book because it is considered to be “the most intelligent and important pluralist statement” by a U.S. political scientist. Indeed, G. William Domhoff has suggested that mainstream political scientists considered Dahl’s study “the answer to all that supposedly ailed the social sciences in the 1960s.” It refuted Hunter’s (1953) claim that a relative handful of business leaders dominated Atlanta, and even more importantly, it “offered analogies with national politics that few other cities could provide” because of its “highly competitive two-party system” (Dahl, 1961, v–vi). “The United States is New Haven writ large,” Domhoff observes that:

In Dahl’s view of New Haven in the 1950s, the local upper class was not based in the business community; the business community was passive and not very influential; and Yale University, for all its wealth, was on the periphery of local politics. The downtown business community could often block proposals it disliked which directly affected its economic interests, but it seldom took an initiatory role. When it came to power, the most important arena in New Haven was the political one. (Ibid.)

In other words, the United States was a pluralist society with a democratic political order where no one group dominated political decision-making. However, Parenti argued that if Dahl’s paradigmatic work was subjected to a more searching analysis, one would find that Dahl, and other pluralists, frequently went to great lengths to verbally obfuscate and suppress their own empirical findings, which were often at odds with their ideological conclusions. The essence of Parenti’s (1970, 115) immanent critique was that in analysing political decision-making pluralists employed “a double standard for the measurement of power.” For example, the studies of community power conducted by Dahl, and his former student Nelson Polsby (1963), both claimed that the most important decision-makers in municipal government were civic and political leaders clustered around the city mayor. Thus, it was the mayor, his aides, and his allies who initiated new community development programs and then sold these programs to the local business

community, Yale University, and the public. The political sphere was therefore autonomous from the direct control and influence of economic elites or a local ruling class.

In the wake of these allegedly empirical findings, Polsby (1963, 88–9) declared that the only way for critics to disprove their conclusions and to prove that municipal authorities were subject to the power of an economic elite would be to document that: (1) members of the elite “customarily give orders to political and civic leaders,” which are then carried out by them; (2) members of the elite routinely and successfully block policies adverse to their interests; or (3) members of the elite place “their own people in positions of leadership.” Dahl and Polsby argued that power elite theorists, such as C. Wright Mills and Floyd Hunter, had only demonstrated the “potential power” of corporate elites, and their failure to examine actual decision-making as an empirically measurable form of political behavior was justification for dismissing the earlier critical scholarship of Mills (1956), Hunter (1963), and Paul Sweezy (1953). Pluralists claimed that these radical analyses of the American power structure had at best demonstrated a high potential for capitalist elites to exercise power, while the works of Dahl and Polsby claimed to demonstrate that this potential was not in fact realized in the decision-making process. As a result, Polsby (1963, 60) dismissed the work of critical scholars for “indulging in empirically unjustified speculation.”

However, as Parenti observes, in their own work these same pluralists had found that very few citizens actually engaged in any direct political, civic, or decision-making activity, while none of New Haven’s key decision-makers were drawn from either black or white lower-income groups. Decision-makers were in fact drawn primarily from professional, business, and higher income strata of the local community. Furthermore, it was recognized by pluralists that members of lower-strata groups did not participate directly in decision-making, nor did they customarily “give orders” to political and civic leaders that were then carried out by them. Neither did these groups routinely and successfully block policy initiatives adverse to their interests, nor did they place “their own people” in positions of leadership. Applying the same decision-making logic that pluralists applied to the economic elite,

one could reasonably conclude that the poor and lower classes did not exercise much, if any, power in American politics.

Rather than draw an obvious conclusion warranted by their own data, Dahl (1961, 164, 180–81) argued that lower class groups exercised “a moderate degree of indirect influence” through their power to elect officials. When confronted with the fact that most Americans do not vote regularly in municipal elections, and that the less educated and less affluent are the most likely to not vote, Dahl (1961, 101–02, 164) responded that the mass of non-voters in the United States could be *imputed* to exercise indirect power through “influential contact” with neighbors, friends, and relatives who do vote. However, claims of indirect influence were readily dismissed by Dahl and Polsby when applied to the power of economic elites over elected officials.

In addition, Dahl (1961, 164) imputed a particularly important form of preemptive power to non-voters by asserting that “elected leaders keep the real or imagined preferences of constituents *constantly in mind* [italics added] in deciding what policies to adopt or reject.” Polsby (1963, 134) dismissed challenges to this claim as an “inappropriate and arbitrary” effort to impose middle- and upper-class values of political participation and civic engagement to the lower classes. He (1963, 134) asserted that “most of the American communities studied in any detail seem to be relatively healthy political organisms” and thus there was no reason for concern about the status of political democracy in the United States. According to Polsby, acquiescence, passivity, and conservatism were the norm in American politics, because most people were satisfied with the political system’s allocated outputs. Yet, one year after Polsby published these statements, the Watts neighborhood of Los Angeles was in flames soon to be followed by urban riots across the United States.

Thus, Parenti (1970, 116) suggested

that instead of declaring them [the lower and working classes] to be an unknown but contented entity, we allow ourselves the simple expedient of directly investigating the less privileged elements of a community to determine why they are not active, and what occurs when they do attempt to become active.

As Parenti pointed out, academic studies of policy struggles involving lower-status groups were a rarity in American political science. Parenti proposed that we should instead observe power “from the bottom up” to correct the empirical shortcomings of pluralist theory. By unraveling the contradictions between ideological statements and empirical fact, Parenti laid the foundation for a critique of power from below; namely, a concept of power developed from the point of view of the excluded, the oppressed, and the marginalized in American society.

Conceptual critique

The immanent critique of pluralism raised numerous questions about its conceptual and methodological limitations as a theory. The most significant conceptual critiques involved efforts to further develop the concepts of *non-decision-making* and *preemptive decision-making*. Peter Bachrach’s and Morton Baratz’s article on the “Two Faces of Power” (1962) made these concepts central to critical political science. Matthew Crenson (1970, 1971), however, conducted the first empirical and historical analysis of community power designed to illustrate how one could operationalize the concept of non-decision-making on an empirical basis. Crenson (1970, 144) argued that political scientists should recognize that “there is something to be learned from political inaction – from *nonevents*, *nonissues*, and *nondecisions*.” Political inaction is a way of exercising political power that maintains the status quo in a policy arena. To demonstrate his claim, Crenson (1970, 144–5) drew on comparative case studies of local air pollution policy, including the absence of such policies, to illustrate how “the decision-making process [analysed by pluralists] is one by which the winners of the political game are determined; non-decision-making helps determine what the game will be in the first place.” Crenson (1970, 145) demonstrated in concrete detail how “the political issues that generate data for pluralist studies of local politics are the ones that have managed to pass through the filtering processes of non-decision-making.” However, Crenson (1970, 144–5) argued that pluralists never attempted “to account for the seemingly important decisions that are never made, or the seemingly critical issues that never arise,” particularly issues of concern to

poor and working class citizens or those that might adversely affect business, corporate, and upper class interests.

Crenson demonstrates that non-decisions are observable and often (though not always) involve a conscious decision to exclude or suppress a potential issue from the decision-making agenda (Bachrach and Baratz 1963). However, Crenson (1970, 148) also hypothesized that many issues, and the groups affected by them, are excluded from the formal decision-making process, because of industry’s preemptive “reputation for power” among political decision-makers (see Lukes 2005). In his analysis of various public policies, Parenti (1970, 113) also points to business’s “powers of pre-emption” to illustrate a key shortcoming of behavioralist methodology; namely, that pluralists failed to acknowledge “that corporate leaders often have no need to involve themselves in decision-making because sufficient anticipatory consideration is given to their interests by officeholders.”

Theoretical alternatives to pluralism

Critical political scientists soon concluded that it was necessary to move beyond “anti-pluralism” and the critique of behavioralism to a genuinely new political science. Marvin Surkin and Alan Wolfe (1970, 11) suggested that critical political scientists should recognize that any effort to restructure American political institutions, as well as their underlying social and economic foundations, would require “the development of new modes of radical political thought and action.” However, there were both “liberal” and “radical” theoretical alternatives competing to become the new political science.

Parenti (1970, 112) observes that a liberal group of “anti-pluralists” were raising troubling questions about whether elites were mutually restrained by competitive interaction with other elites, as claimed by the theory of democratic elitism, or by pressure from the masses as claimed by many pluralists. Henry S. Kariel (1961) and Grant McConnell (1966) argued that case studies of interest group influence over the policy process revealed that powerful interest groups did not compete against each other, but captured those sectors of the state and public policy that directly affected their special interest. This process of

parceling out governmental power to special interest groups meant that “pluralism” was incapable of achieving the public interest, because government decisions were controlled by private special interests for their own benefit. Special interest elites tended to predominate in their respective spheres of government policy, with the automobile industry controlling transportation policy, agribusinesses lobbying for high agricultural subsidies, and the oil industry dominating energy policy. This strain of anti-pluralism was eventually identified most closely with Theodore Lowi’s (1969, 51) “interest group liberalism,” which describes the *actual functioning* of interest groups in government as “a vulgarized version of the pluralist model.”

However, a more radical strain of thought accepted Dahl’s and Polsby’s methodological challenge by claiming to prove empirically that the United States has an upper class and that national and local governments are dominated by a capitalist ruling class. Much of this work traced its origin to C. Wright Mills (1956, 300), who dismissed pluralist theory “as a set of images out of a fairy tale.” In contrast to the pluralist model of group competition and dispersed inequalities, Mills (1956, 3–4) argued that a tightly knit coalition of the corporate rich, military warlords, and a servile political directorate – a power elite – governed the United States.

G. William Domhoff (1967, 11), a political sociologist, built on Mills’ observations, but went beyond his theoretical claims by documenting in meticulous detail how a small corporate elite’s “control of corporations, foundations, elite universities, the Presidency, the federal judiciary, the military, and the CIA qualifies the American upper class as a ‘governing class’, especially in the light of the wealth owned and the income received by members of that exclusive social group.” In a short time, however, power elite theory would morph into class analysis and Marxism with the publication of Ralph Miliband’s *The State in Capitalist Society* (1969). As with Domhoff, Miliband’s analysis did not sidestep a direct confrontation with official political science. Ralph Miliband’s *The State in Capitalist Society* was not only among the most important books to challenge pluralism with an empirically based class analysis during this time, at a theoretical level, it also returned the concept of the state to a prominent role in American political science.

The radical turn in critical political science also extended the critique of pluralism from domestic to foreign policy. Surkin and Wolfe (1970, 169) claimed that “in no field of political science has the dominant ideology run more rampant than in the study of international politics and foreign policy.” Thus, they insisted that an analysis of American imperialism was essential to understanding U.S. foreign policies, including the war in Vietnam. In this vein, James Petras suggested that the process of U.S. foreign policy formation parallels domestic policy formation, because it emanates from the same ruling class (Perlo 1950; Peschek 1987). Petras (1970, 186–7) analysed U.S. relations with Latin America and found that U.S. foreign policy decisions were controlled by “linkage groups,” which were networks of American investors, financiers, and business executives linked to foreign military officers who had been trained in the United States and depended on the U.S. for economic and military support. American business was also able to exert “indirect influence” on foreign governments through its pre-emptive reputation for power and its real ability to withhold investment and loans or to manipulate import quotas for affecting one-crop or one-mineral export dependent nations.

These works, and many others, ignited what came to be known as the community power debate, as well as debates about U.S. foreign policy as imperialism, but they also called attention to the fact that a critical political science could not only be an anti-science, but needed to develop an alternative theory of class structure, a theory of the state, and a theory of imperialism, although as others would soon point out, it is also needed to integrate concepts of gender, race, and ecology, as well as other forms of non-class identity and political action.

Finally, in the context of growing inequality and the 2007–08 financial and economic crisis, several prominent American political scientists published studies that strongly challenged pluralist accounts of the distribution of power in the United States. Martin Gilens and Benjamin Page concluded that “majorities of the American public actually have little influence over the policies our government adopts” (2014, 575). In a related study, Page and Jeffrey Winters state,

We believe it is now appropriate to move a step further and think about the possibility of *extreme* political inequality, involving great political influence by a very small number of extremely wealthy individuals. We argue that it is useful to think about the U.S. political system in terms of oligarchy (2009, 744).

Similarly, Page, Larry Bartels, and Jason Seawright find that “if policy makers do weigh citizens’ policy preferences differentially based on their income or wealth, the result will not only significantly violate democratic ideals of political equality, but will also affect the substantive contours of American public policy” (2013, 68). In fact, a recent study of the U.S. Congress by Witko, Morgan, Kelly, and Enns (2021) concludes that the congressional economic agenda has been increasingly “hijacked” by wealthy business interests. These sobering empirical findings support theories of economic elite domination, which is a conclusion much at odds with pluralist theory. Yet, despite six decades of overwhelming empirical evidence that pluralism is a flawed conceptual framework for understanding American politics, the official theme of the 2021 annual meeting of the American Political Science Association (APSA) was “promoting pluralism.”

CLYDE W. BARROW

References

- Bachrach, Peter and Morton S. Baratz. 1962. “Two Faces of Power.” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 56, No. 4 (December), 947–52.
- Bachrach, Peter and Morton S. Baratz. 1963. “Decisions and Non-Decisions: An Analytical Framework.” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 57, No. 3 (September), 632–42.
- Crenson, Matthew A. 1970. “Nonissues in City Politics: The Case of Air Pollution.” In *An End to Political Science: The Caucus Papers*, edited by Marvin Surkin and Alan Wolfe, 144–66. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Crenson, Matthew A. 1971. *The Un-Politics of Air Pollution: A Study of Non-Decisionmaking in the Cities*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Dahl, Robert A. 1961. *Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Domhoff, G. William. 1967. *Who Rules America?* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Easton, David. 1953. *The Political System: An Inquiry into the State of Political Science*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Gilens, Martin, and Benjamin I. Page. 2014. “Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens,” *Perspectives on Politics*, Vol. 12, No. (Fall), 564–81.
- Hunter, Floyd. 1963. *Community Power Structure*. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books.
- Kariel, Henry. 1961. *The Decline of American Pluralism*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Lowi, Theodore J. 1969. *The End of Liberalism*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Co.
- Lukes, Steven. 2005. *Power: A Radical View*, 2nd expanded edition. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- McConnell, Grant. 1966. *Private Power and American Democracy*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Miliband, Ralph. 1969. *The State in Capitalist Society*. New York: Basic Books.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1956. *The Power Elite*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Page, Benjamin I., Larry M. Bartels, and Jason Seawright. 2013. “Democracy and the Policy Preferences of Wealthy Americans,” *Perspectives on Politics*, Vol. 11, No. 1. (March), 51–73.
- Parenti, Michael. 1970. “Power and Pluralism: A View from the Bottom.” In *An End to Political Science: The Caucus Papers*, edited by Marvin Surkin and Alan Wolfe, 111–43. New York, NY: Basic Books, Inc.
- Parsons, Talcott. 1951. *The Social System*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Perlo, Victor. 1950. *American Imperialism*. New York: International Publishers.
- Peschek, Joseph G. 1987. *Policy Planning Organizations: Elite Agendas and Rightward Turn*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Petras, James. 1970. “Patterns of Intervention: U.S. Foreign Policy and Business in Latin America.” In *An End to Political Science: The Caucus Papers*, edited by Marvin Surkin and Alan Wolfe, 186–214. New York, NY: Basic Books, Inc.
- Polsby, Nelson. 1963. *Community Power and Political Theory*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Surkin, Marvin. 1970. “Sense and Nonsense in Politics.” In *An End to Political Science: The Caucus Papers*, edited by Marvin Surkin and Alan Wolfe, 13–33. New York, NY: Basic Books, Inc.
- Sweezy, Paul M. 1953. *The Present as History: Essays and Reviews on Capitalism and Socialism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Winters, Jeffrey A., and Benjamin I. Page. 2009. “Oligarchy in the United States?” *Perspectives on Politics* Vol. 7, No. 4 (December), 731–51.
- Witko, Christopher, Jana Morgan, Nathan J. Kelly, and Peter K. Enns. 2021. *Hijacking the Agenda: Economic Power and Political Influence*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Further readings

- Harrington, Michael. 1962. *The Other America: Poverty in the United States*. New York: Macmillan.
- Hirsch, Herbert. 1970. *Poverty and Politicization: Political Socialization in an American Sub-Culture*. New York: Free Press.
- Piven, Frances Fox and Richard A. Cloward. 1971.

Regulating the Poor: The Functions of Public Welfare. New York: Pantheon Books.

See also

Theories of the State; Marxism; G. William Domhoff; Ralph Miliband

2. Power structure analysis

Power structure analysis is a social science approach that seeks to study and understand the distribution and exercise of power in different types of society, especially in developed capitalist states. The term “structure” suggests that power is organized in relatively systematic and unequal ways. The study of power structures may be conducted by researchers of many theoretical or political orientations. This entry centers, for the most part, on power structure analysis from left-wing or “critical” perspectives. A core claim of these scholars is that such structures are not inevitable or invariant but are historically specific and subject to variation and recasting through social developments and political struggles that rearrange the institutions that organize power in any given society. While power structure analysis may be applied to a wide array of societies, past and present, this chapter focuses on the power structure of contemporary America.

Initially, we must consider the term “power” and its multiple possible meanings. As the philosopher Bertrand Russell once put it,

the fundamental concept in social science is Power in the sense in which Energy is the fundamental concept in physics. Like energy, power has many forms, such as wealth, armaments, influence on opinion. No one of these can be regarded as subordinate to any other, and there is no form from which the others are derivable.

For Russell, “power is the ability to produce intended effects,” a definition that, despite modifications, has held up rather well (Russell 1938, 12–13). Clyde W. Barrow (1993, 13) explains that the methodology of power structure research “views the organized control, possession and ownership of key resources as the basis for exercising power in any society. Key resources typically consist of wealth, status, force, and knowledge.” In critical political science, it is fair to say that most analysis of the power structures of developed capitalist states foregrounds economic and material sources of power, as well as class conflict, and how they “intersect” with ideological, military, and political

networks of power, as well as with racial, gender-based, and other forms of hierarchy and dominance.

The operations of power, like those of energy, are not always apparent and must be inferred or measured through the use of several indicators. Three have been widely used by power structure analysts, and each has strengths and weaknesses (Domhoff 2022, 29–35). First, the “Who Benefits?” indicator looks at the distribution of valued experiences and objects in a society. In contemporary American society “material” values such as income and property ownership are pursued through vigorous competition for them. The allocation of these values, as measured by inequalities in the distribution of wealth and income, or changes in the ratio of CEO to average worker pay over time, may be seen as a power indicator. Second, the “Who Governs?” indicator examines who holds important positions in key institutions and decision-making groups. The over-representation or under-representation of various social groups and classes, such as women, people of color, and the poor, on the one hand, or the wealthy, corporate executives, and graduates of elite law schools, on the other, indicate relative power or lack thereof. Third, “Who Wins?” is concerned with the decision-making process on issues where there is disagreement, such as environmental legislation, taxation, and labor union policy. Power structure analysis looks at which groups, coalitions, and classes prevail on important issues over time, not just in final outcomes, but in the process of initiating, modifying, or blocking proposed actions. In addition, some researchers use a “reputational” method of searching for power in a community. Because this indicator derives from interviews of community members about their perceptions of who is powerful, it is the most “subjective” indicator and thus in need of supplemental findings. This power indicator is best suited for the study of local power structures as exemplified by Floyd Hunter’s book discussed below.

Theoretical traditions

The role of elites in exercising power was emphasized by early twentieth century thinkers such as Vilfredo Pareto, Gaetano Mosca, and Robert Michels. Pareto and Mosca saw elite rule as natural and probably desirable.

Michels coined the term the “iron law of oligarchy” in his study of political parties. Later in his career, Michels moved away from his early socialist leanings, coming to view rule by elites as inevitable and offering support for Mussolini’s fascist movement in Italy. Thus, their work was far from “critical.”

In the U.S. systematic power structure research dates from the mid-twentieth century. A seminal work was Floyd Hunter’s 1953 book *Community Power Structure*, a study of Atlanta (disguised as a “Regional City” in the book), which used a “reputational” method in which the names of civic, governmental, business, and status leaders were provided to “judges” who ranked persons in each list as the most influential people in the community in terms of ability to lead others (Hunter 1953, 264–5). For Atlanta in the immediate postwar years, Hunter’s central finding was that the reality of power deviated sharply from the ideals of representative government, with policy making centered on the city’s business leaders. Hunter (1953, 139) found that: “The top group of the power hierarchy has been isolated and defined as comprised of policy-makers ... These men are largely drawn from the businessmen’s class in Regional City.” Hunter was well-aware that his analysis punctured democratic pieties, noting that the relationship he found between governors and governed “does not square with the concepts of democracy we have been taught to revere” and expressing concern that American democracy “is in danger of losing vitality in dealing with problems that affect all in common” (Hunter 1953, 1).

C. Wright Mills’s 1956 book *The Power Elite* examined the system of power of the United States as a whole and became hugely influential for later power structure analysis and for critical social science more widely. *The Power Elite* was the last in a “trilogy” on American society that began with a study of the labor movement, followed by a book about white-collar workers and the middle class (Mills 1948; Mills 1951). Mills defined the power elite in terms of the leadership positions of three distinct “institutional orders” or social realms: the economic order, the political order, and the military order. In other words, the military leadership, the higher reaches of the federal state, and the corporate elite each formed part of a triumvirate of power that was hegemonic in mid-twentieth century U.S. politics.

“By the power elite we refer to those political, economic, and military circles which as an intricate set of overlapping cliques share decisions having at least national consequences. In so far as national events are decided, the power elite are those who decide them” (Mills 1956, 18).

The rise of a power elite at the national level accompanied the diminishing independent power of local society, which “has become part of a national economy; its status and power hierarchies have come to be subordinate parts of the larger hierarchies of the nation” (Mills 1956, 39). Mills differentiated “sophisticated conservatives” from “practical conservatives” in the business community, a distinction that was to become important in later New Left theories of “corporate liberalism” and for power structure analysts who point to the importance of ideological and sectoral variations and conflicts within the capitalist class.

In the higher circles of business and its associations, there has long been a tension, for example, between the “old guard” of practical conservatives and the business liberals or sophisticated conservatives. What the old guard represents is the outlook, if not always the intelligent interests, of the more narrow economic concerns. What the business liberals represent is the outlook and the interests of the new propertied class as a whole. They are “sophisticated” because they are more flexible in adjusting to such political facts of life as the New Deal and big labor, because they have taken over and used the dominant liberal rhetoric for their own purposes, and because they have, in general, attempted to get on top of, or even slightly ahead of, the trend of these developments, rather than to fight it as practical conservatives are wont to do (Mills 1956, 122).

The Power Elite represented an alternative to the “theory of balance” or “pluralism” developed by political scientists in the postwar years, based on the idea of a political economy regulated by the balancing of competing interests. While Mills thought the theory had some validity when applied to the “middle levels of power” and processes of Congressional decision-making, “those having real power in the American state today are not merely brokers of power, resolvers of conflict, or compromisers of varied and clashing interest – they represent and indeed embody quite specific national

interests and policies” (Mills 1956, 267). Mills concluded (1956, 361) that members of the power elite are the “commanders of power unequal in human history, they have succeeded within the American system of organized irresponsibility.”

Drawing on the work of Mills and others, the sociologist G. William Domhoff has been the leading power structure scholar in the United States since the publication of *Who Rules America?* (Domhoff 1967), which has gone through eight editions as of 2022. While Domhoff (2006, 550) agreed with Mills that economic, political, and military power are potentially independent power bases, in the case of the United States, he concluded that “historical and sociological research leads me to place far more emphasis than Mills did on corporate capitalism and class conflict as the dominant factors in the power equation.”

Domhoff (2014, x) combined Mill’s organization approach to power with an examination of how “the owners and top-level managers of large companies – the corporate rich – work together to maintain themselves as the core of the dominant power group.” More recently, Domhoff (2022, 4) noted the opposition the corporate-conservative alliance faces from far-right ultra-conservatives who object to the positions of mainstream corporate leaders on gun control, gay marriage, abortion, and voting rights. Domhoff (2014, xvi) showed how the role of policy elites in lobbying, opinion-shaping, candidate selection, and – of great importance – policy-planning processes ensure that the corporate-conservative coalition tends to prevail over the labor-liberal coalition on core class issues pertaining to “wages and profits, the rate and progressivity of taxation, the usefulness of labor unions, and the degree to which business should be regulated by government.” He (2014, xiii) argued that “the ability of the corporate rich to transform their economic power into policy expertise and political access makes them the most important influence on the federal government.” Class or corporate dominance theorists use research to demonstrate how the corporate community influences specific policy decisions by the federal government:

Drawing on a detailed tracing of linkages among individuals, institutions, money flows, and policy issues, this decisional model suggests there are four relatively distinct but over-

lapping processes through which the corporate community, and more generally the power elite, control the public agenda and then win on most issues that are taken up by the federal government. They are the special-interest, policy-planning, opinion-shaping, and candidate-selection processes, with the last term referring to the individually oriented and relatively issueless political campaigns that have predominated in the American two-party system (Domhoff 2007, 103).

Understanding the American power structure

In the 1970s, a number of U.S. political scientists and sociologists developed and engaged with the ideas of Mills, Domhoff, and others as a way of better understanding the politics of capitalist democracy in the United States. Political economy, class analysis, and power structure research were central to these views, and its practitioners were mainly though not entirely leftists and radicals. In the background were the struggles associated with the New Left of the 1960s, the economic downturn of the 1970s, and the emergence of radical currents in American social science disciplines that called into question “mainstream” or “conventional” approaches, such as the Caucus for a New Political Science as a counter-current within the American Political Science Association, and which published the journal *New Political Science*. Other discipline-specific publications such as *Review of Radical Political Economics*, *Radical History*, and the *Insurgent Sociologist* (later *Critical Sociology*) emerged around the same time. Several leading American government and politics textbooks from that decade were shaped by power structure analysis and incorporated it, and other radical perspectives, including *American Politics: Policies, Power, and Change* by Kenneth Dolbeare and Murray Edelman, *The Politics of Power: A Critical Introduction to American Government* by Ira Katznelson and Mark Kesselman, *Democracy for the Few* by Michael Parenti, and *The American Political System: A Radical Approach* by Edward S. Greenberg.

At the same time, power structure analysis entered into debates on the left about “theories of the state” that were set off by exchanges between the British political scientist Ralph Miliband and the French-Greek sociologist Nicos Poulantzas. The positions

assumed in this debate became known as “instrumentalism” and “structuralism,” with Mills, Domhoff, and Miliband placed in the former category. This term was somewhat misleading in that all these scholars acknowledge that capital has structural power owing to its control over the economy (Barrow 2008). So-called instrumentalist scholars conducted systematic empirical research using social scientific methods and tools to answer a number of questions about the American power structure. How do the wealthy and corporations direct money to political candidates and parties, sometimes openly and sometime surreptitiously through “dark money”? What role do special interests play in shaping legislation and lobbying Congress? In what ways does the corporate community attain political cohesion and consensus? What are the major lines of conflict and division within the power structure, and on what are they based?

Power structure research combines content analysis and network analysis. Content analysis studies power structure policies, plans, and ideas, as contained in documents, reports, policy proposals, speeches, and legislative drafts. Reflecting the importance of the policy-planning process, Joseph G. Peschek (1987) conducted a content study of five important policy-planning organizations in the 1970s and 1980s, and found an elite rightward drift of both moderate and conservative organization on core economic, welfare state, and international issues during this period. A network analysis studies the people and organizations that make up the power structure, and how they work to influence government and public policy. Also interested in the policy-planning network, sociologist Val Burris examined changes in its composition, interlocks, and political character in the 1980s and 1990s. Burris (2008) found that “corporate liberals” had become more isolated from big business “moderate conservatives” and were replaced by several new “ultraconservative” groups that have become more influential in the twenty-first century. His findings add to our understanding of the conservative turn in U.S. state policy in that period.

What has been learned about the U.S. power structure in recent years? Power structure analysis is carried out by independent and nonprofit individuals and organizations, such as the money and politics research group OpenSecrets, as well as by academics. An

interesting development in U.S. political science has been the publication of a number of studies of the American political system by prominent scholars that, in largely unacknowledged ways, support power structure analysis and undermine theories of pluralism. For example, Jacob Hacker and Paul Pierson, in *Winner-Take-All Politics* (2010) developed a relatively comprehensive and challenging analysis of recent developments in American politics and their relationship to growing inequality and business mobilization. Brian Waddell (2011, 659–62) applauded Hacker and Pierson for breaking with the “prevailing view of most American politics scholars that politics and political power are more or less autonomous from economic forces and private power,” but he found that Hacker and Pierson’s theme of “politics as organized combat” produces a “modified interest group analysis that stresses the advantages of organization in winning political battles.” He encouraged scholars to overcome their analytic amnesia and re-engage with the scholarly tradition that raised questions “concerning the interplay of politics and markets, democracy and capitalism, and public and private power.” Addressing such issues in their book *Billionaires and Stealth Politics* Benjamin I. Page, Jason Seawright, and Matthew J. Lacombe (2019, 134) found that “*many or most* billionaires have *actively worked* to enact policies *opposed to the wishes of most Americans*, while *intentionally trying* to conceal their thoughts and actions about those policies by staying silent about them” (italics in original). Extending power structure to the level of states, Gordon Lafer (2017) and Alexander Hertel-Fernandez (2019) have demonstrated, to use the subtitles of the books respectively, “how corporations are remaking America one state at a time” and “how conservative activists, big businesses, and wealthy donors reshaped the American states – and the nation.” It is to be hoped that political science and other scholars, critical and mainstream, will deepen their analysis of power structures, and how they are made and unmade in the unsettling politics of our time.

JOSEPH G. PESCHEK

References

- Barrow, Clyde W. 1993. *Critical Theories of the State: Marxist, Neo-Marxist, Post-Marxist*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

- Barrow, Clyde W. 2008. "Ralph Miliband and the Instrumentalist Theory of the State: The (Mis) Construction of an Analytic Concept." In *Class, Power, and the State in Capitalist Society: Essays on Ralph Miliband*, edited by Paul Wetherly, Clyde W. Barrow, and Peter Burnham, 84–108. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Burris, Val. 2008. "The Interlocking Structure of the Policy-Planning Network and the Right Turn in U.S. State Policy." *Research in Political Sociology* 17: 3–42.
- Domhoff, G. William. 1967. *Who Rules America?* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Domhoff, G. William. 2006. "Mills's *The Power Elite* 50 Years Later." *Contemporary Sociology* 35, no. 6 (November): 547–50.
- Domhoff, G. William. 2007. "C. Wright Mills, Power Structure Research, and the Failures of Mainstream Political Science." *New Political Science* 29:1 (March): 97–114.
- Domhoff, G. William. 2014. *Who Rules America? The Triumph of the Corporate Rich*, 7th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Domhoff, G. William. 2022. *Who Rules America? The Corporate Rich, White Nationalist Republicans, and Inclusionary Democrats in the 2020s*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Hacker, Jacob S., and Paul Pierson. 2010. *Winner-Take-All Politics: How Washington Made the Rich Richer – And Turned Its Back on the Middle Class*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Hertel-Fernandez, Alexander. 2019. *State Capture: How Conservative Activists, Big Businesses, and Wealthy Donors Reshaped the American States – and the Nation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hunter, Floyd. 1953. *Community Power Structure: A Study of Decision Makers*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Lafer, Gordon. 2017. *The One Percent Solution: How Corporations are Remaking America One State at a Time*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1948. *The New Men of Power: America's Labor Leaders*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1951. *White Collar*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1956. *The Power Elite*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Page, Benjamin L., Jason Seawright, and Matthew J. Lacombe. 2019. *Billionaires and Stealth Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Peschek, Joseph G. 1987. *Policy-Planning Organizations: Elite Agendas and America's Rightward Turn*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Russell, Bertrand. 1938. *Power: A New Social Analysis*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Waddell, Brian. 2011. "A Discussion of Winner Take-All Politics." *Perspectives on Politics* 9 no. 3 (September): 659–62.

3. Critique of positivism and the post-behavioral revolution

This chapter describes three broad phases in the development of critical political science: behavioral, anti-behavioral, or post-behavioral, and the movements for Perestroika and Making Political Science Matter. Political scientists have long been critical of their discipline. This is especially true with respect to ideas about theory and methodology. In the post-World War II years, the leaders of the behavioral movement in political science often styled themselves as the “Young Turks” in the discipline, even as later in their careers they would chide others as “youngsters in a hurry” (Goodin 2009). Early behavioralists, like Harold Lasswell (1902–78), David B. Truman (1913–2003), Robert A. Dahl (1915–2014), David Easton (1917–2014), and others, embraced aspects of positivism as a means to criticize then dominant methods and practices in the discipline. Positivism was particularly important to behavioralism’s conception of what “science” ought to be, that is, rigorous, systematic, hypothesis driven, and deductive, aimed at some form of general theory, generalizable, parsimonious, etc. Many of these “rebels” would later become leaders in the discipline, and so, have their turn at being the object of critique (Eulau 1968).

In the late 1960s, the anti-behavioralists appropriated the image of revolutionaries to criticize the new behavioral mainstream in political science. The disciplinary historian Robert Adcock notes that “in its first twenty years the image of a behavioral revolution thus evolved from a rallying cry of young behavioralists looking confidently to the future, into the feared other of anti-behavioral scholars bemoaning the present” (Adcock 2007, 181). In the early 2000s, another revolt against the behavioral and positivistic mainstream emerges under the banner of Perestroika and Making Political Science Matter. For many political scientists familiar with the behavioral and anti-behavioral debates, this felt like *déjà vu* all over again, as the new insurgents called once again for methodological plural-

ism and for greater political relevance in the discipline’s research.

The development of critical political science parallels the movements and counter-movements over the identity of the political science discipline. This narrative of the discipline’s history moves from a period when the mainstream in political science has embraced positivism, which accepts the fact-value dichotomy and the idea of objective knowledge in social science, to a narrative emphasizing a discipline that recognizes the limits of a positivistic approach to science as it was defined by many early proponents of behavioralism in political science.

The behavioral critique

By the late 1960s, the “behavioral” study of politics had come to mean a lot of different things to political scientists. The political theorist and disciplinary historian James Farr (1995, 216) identifies behavioralism with “intentional actions, deliberate decisions, procedural rules, negotiated bargains, role playing ... as well as inputs and outputs of whole systems.” One thing these diverse strands had in common was their resounding critique of the “traditional” in modern political science. An early example of a behavioral critique is found in David Easton’s classic *The Political System: An Inquiry into the State of Political Science* (1953). Easton’s critique is focused on what he takes to be traditional political science and especially the type of training he received at Harvard University in the history of political thought. Easton admonishes political scientists about the failures of traditional political theory, and the need for the development of general theory, such as the type of systems theory he developed to explain the workings of the U.S. political system.

Following the publication of Thomas Kuhn’s *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962), the words “revolution”, “normal science”, and “paradigm” were on the minds of many political scientists. These were perfect conditions for group identity formation and for rhetoric about “us” vs. “them” in postwar American political science. By the early 1960s, behavioralism appeared to dominate the discipline. A case in point is Robert Dahl’s (1961) classic article in the *American Political Science Review*, “The Behavioral Approach in Political Science: Epitaph for

a Monument to a Successful Protest.” In this article, Dahl declares the ultimate victory of behavioralism over the methods and practices of traditional, non-behavioral, political science.

The idea of a new type of theory, as contrasted with classical political thought, is a major focus of early behavioralism in the U.S. The political theorist and disciplinary historian John Gunnell (1983, 26) adds that “the basic thrust of this ‘theoretical revolution’ was a turn toward functional and systems analysis as opposed to a focus on institutions such as the state.” In *The Political System*, Easton’s (1953, 6) desire to create a general theory of the political system is expressed in the language of “a scientific approach to social knowledge.” In 1953, Easton finds that the majority of his fellow political scientists were reluctant to fully incorporate the scientific method into their work. Throughout his career, Easton advocated for a form of general theory as the cornerstone of behavioral political science. However, after a revolt against behavioralism in the 1960s and early 1970s, a less grand version of behavioral theory would prevail in the discipline (Gunnell 1993, 262).

The anti-behavioral critique

There are many forms of anti-behavioral critique in political science. Some scholars challenge the positivist conception of value neutrality with the claim that the values and ideologies of researchers are embedded in the theories that guide their analysis. Other scholars criticize the drive to discover universal laws in the social sciences akin to those in the natural sciences such as physics that can explain all phenomena in question. Similarly, there were many attempts by scholars to question the applicability of the scientific method to the study of human beings and social phenomena (Farr 1995). The common goal of these varied critiques was to dislodge the dominance of behavioralism and to make space for more methodological pluralism in the political science discipline.

The debate between behavioralists and anti-behavioralists was quite pitched in the 1950s and 1960s as the broader debate between positivists and anti-positivists came to occupy a number of social scientists in a variety of academic fields. In an entry in the *Dictionary of World Politics*, the political sci-

entists Graham Evans and Jeffrey Newnham (1998, 541) discuss how many traditional scholars became anti-behavioral and took the stance that “scientific methods involving strict standards of proof and verification, quantification, measurement and the construction of hypothetical models are wholly inappropriate when dealing with a subject matter that involves human purpose.”

The first signs of a coming revolt against behavioral dominance appeared in the early 1960s, with a high-profile debate among political theorists over the significance of behavioralism in the discipline. This debate played out in the pages of the *APSR* in 1963, when John Schaar and Sheldon Wolin, both Berkeley political theorists, took aim at a now well-known collection of essays edited by the University of Chicago Straussian political philosopher Herbert Storing. The 1962 volume by Storing, titled *Essays on the Scientific Study of Politics*, criticizes the behavioral mainstream for its lack of imagination and impoverished sense of the past, and led to what one commentator has dubbed, “The Wolin-Strauss Dust-Up of 1963” (Barber 2006). This is the subtitle given to Benjamin Barber’s contribution to the *APSR* centennial issue, in which he discusses how the authors of the chapters in the Storing volume responded to the strong criticism leveled by two political theorists writing at the University of California, Berkeley.

Schaar and Wolin (1963, 125) open their critique of behavioralism by saying that “the study of politics has become increasingly scientific: that is, behavioral, quantitative, empirically oriented, experimental where possible, rigorous, and precise.” For this “new political science,” Schaar and Wolin (1963, 128) say a thoroughgoing philosophical treatment is needed, and though the Storing volume promises such a treatment, it fails at that task, because it is merely “polemical” and “ideological.” This early “dust up” between political theorists shows that critics of behavioralism in the 1960s were not on the same page about why it should be opposed.

Much of the impetus for the behavioral revolution, especially with respect to the behavioralists’ notion of “traditional theory,” was driven by a challenge to the mainstream from newcomers within the subfield of political theory. There was an influx of émigré scholars in the 1930s and 1940s, many of them German scholars fleeing Nazi persecu-

tion. Given their experience fleeing Europe, many émigré scholars were quite skeptical of the liberal democratic values that dominated U.S. culture, which in their view, were implicated in the rise of fascism and totalitarianism in twentieth-century Europe. Within the field of political theory, another form of counter-revolution was underway as many American political theorists took aim at the growing popularity and style of theorizing of the many German émigré scholars who took up academic positions in the U.S. Scholars like Leo Strauss, Hannah Arendt, Herbert Marcuse, Eric Voegelin, and others were largely anti-behavioral, but they were still convenient targets for political theorists interested in doing theory in less esoteric and/or grand ways (Gunnell 1991, 388).

Gunnell (1983, 17) highlights how a “decline” of political theory narrative was used in different ways by political philosophers and behavioralists in the 1950s and 1960s. The political philosopher Leo Strauss, an anti-behavioralist, for whom the “very notion of theory in modern social science, as exemplified in the behavioral movement signified the ‘decline of political philosophy,’” is juxtaposed to Easton, a behavioralist, who criticized the traditional “identification of theory with the history of political theory [which] was symptomatic of the ‘decline’” in political theory. Founders of behavioral political science, like Easton, regarded political philosophy and its political science analog “the history of political theory,” as an antiquated version of what would become behavioral, scientific, or empirical political theory, while anti-behavioralists saw the rise of behavioral theory as an impoverishment of political theory and/or philosophy.

In his *New Handbook of Political Science* entry on “Political Science: The History of the Discipline,” the political scientist and behavioralist Gabriel Almond recounts the impact of the émigré scholars to the history of the discipline. In Almond’s (1996, 76) terms, “much of German social science scholarship was effectively transplanted to the United States,” and many of the “exiled” scholars “made important contributions to the behavioral revolution in the United States as well as to the various trends which attacked it.” With the rare exception (e.g., Gunnell 1993), this is an important point which is rarely emphasized in narratives about the behavioral revolution. In effect, Almond recognizes

that émigré scholars were not a monolithic group, as some joined the behavioral movement, and some were anti-behavioral and lamented the transformation of identities and practices in political science. The revolt against behavioralism is reflected institutionally in 1967 when the Caucus for a New Political Science organized the proliferation of anti-behavioralists into an insurgent movement within the discipline for the purpose of voicing their concerns about a discipline dominated by behavioralism (McCoy and Playford 1967; Surkin and Wolfe 1970). The Caucus for a New Political Science would go on to found two leading journals: *Politics and Society* (1970) and *New Political Science* (1979) (Barrow 2017).

Two years later, in his 1969 APSA presidential address, titled “The New Revolution in Political Science,” Easton discursively ushers in what he calls the “post-behavioral revolution.” Easton hopes that this new revolution in political science will redirect the efforts of some political scientists toward more practical, policy-related, and relevant research. Despite Easton’s frank concessions to the anti-behavioralists, and in particular to critics of “a neopositivist conception of natural science, with its claims to be value-free,” the behavioral revolution was still “remembered as giving to the discipline of political science in the United States its principal identity and enduring denomination” (Farr 1995, 219).

This speech also gave voice to the concerns of many political theorists who felt marginalized by the new behavioral orthodoxy and thus took up the banner of anti-behavioralism as discussed earlier. In fact, in the same volume of *APSR* that published Easton’s “New Revolution,” the political theorist Sheldon Wolin published his classic critique of behavioralism and a defense of what he called “epic” theory. By this time, Wolin accepts the fact that behavioralism dominates the discipline. However, Wolin (1969, 1063–4) moves from a recognition that scientific “method is the central fact of the behavioral revolution,” calling this perspective “Methodism,” and counter-poses this status quo to his preferred vision of political theory as epic theory. Wolin wanted to separate political theory so much from the behavioral mainstream that he had gone as far as to petition for a separate department for political theory at the University of California,

Berkeley a few years earlier (Hauptmann 2017).

After the counter-revolution of anti-behavioralists and the proclamation of a “new political science” by the CNPS in 1967 and a “new revolution” by Easton in 1969, it seemed that the days of a strong positivist version of behavioralism were numbered, and space was being opened up for more diverse and eclectic forms of theory and practice in the discipline. For a time, this trope of pluralism seems to be the “rhetoric of the day” (Connolly 1967). Yet, in the early 1970s, work on “behavioralism” was dominated by the ongoing controversy between behavioralists (Somit 1974; Greenstein and Polsby 1975; Freeman 1977) and anti-behavioralists (Surkin and Wolf 1970; Graham and Carey 1972).

The 2000s and the period leading up to the present is a period characterized by another bout of vigorous criticism of the behavioral/post-behavioral mainstream in political science as represented by the so-called “Perestroika” movement (Monroe 2005). This second revolt against behavioral dominance in the discipline clearly shows that the first revolt had been unsuccessful in dislodging its hegemony over the discipline and, moreover, that the power of behavioralism in political science was as strong as ever (Gunnell 2015; Hauptmann 2012). Indeed, this fact partially accounts for the continued growth of disciplinary history and the field’s ongoing fascination with the rise to dominance of behavioralism and the “behavioral revolution” (Berkenpas 2016). In response to this most recent critique of the mainstream, the APSA began publishing *Perspectives on Politics* in 2003, a journal which more centrally focuses on politically relevant research in the discipline. Skeptics often emphasize that political science has never been able to reconcile its desire to be relevant to policymakers as well as citizens due to its emphasis on scientization and professionalization (Gunnell 2015; see also Ricci 1984, Seidelman and Harpham 1985).

For every new age, a new political science is needed, so the critique of the mainstream in the political science makes it possible for the mainstream to avoid orthodoxy and to pursue its twin goals of substance and relevance. It is worth noting that for all their differences, the behavioral and post-behavioral critiques share two salient features. First, they share

a desire to produce scientific and theoretical knowledge that is both rigorous and relevant. Second, both forms of critique have come to embrace the idea of methodological pluralism and seek to encourage a diverse and eclectic political science.

JOSH BERKENPAS

References

- Adcock, Robert. 2007. “Interpreting Behavioralism.” In *Modern Political Science: Anglo-Exchanges since 1880*, edited by Robert Adcock, Mark Bevir, and Shannon C. Stimson, 180–208. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Almond, Gabriel. 1996. “Political Science: The History of the Discipline.” In *New Handbook of Political Science*, edited by Robert E. Goodin and Hans-Dieter Klingemann, 50–89. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Barber, Benjamin R. 2006. “The Politics of Political Science: ‘Value-free’ Theory and the Wolin-Strauss Dust-Up of 1963.” *American Political Science Review*, 100, no. 4: 539–45.
- Barrow Clyde W. 2017. “The Political and Intellectual Origins of New Political Science.” *New Political Science*, 39, no. 4 (December): 437–72.
- Berkenpas, Josh. 2016. “The ‘Behavioural Revolution’? A Genealogy of a Concept.” *European Political Science*, 15: 233–50.
- Connolly, William. 1967. *Political Science and Ideology*. New York: Routledge.
- Dahl, Robert. 1961. “The Behavioral Approach in Political Science: Epitaph for a Monument to a Successful Protest.” *American Political Science Review*, 55, no. 4: 763–72.
- Easton, David. 1951. “The Decline of Modern Political Theory.” *The Journal of Politics*, 13, no. 1: 36–58.
- Easton, David. 1953. *The Political System: An Inquiry into the State of Political Science*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Easton, David. 1968. “Political Science.” *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, Edited by David Sills. New York: MacMillan.
- Easton, David. 1969. “The New Revolution in Political Science.” *APSR*, Vol. 63, No. 4: 1051–61.
- Eulau, Heinz. 1968. “The Behavioral Movement in Political Science: A Personal Document.” *Social Research*, 35: 1–29.
- Evans, Graham and Jeffrey Newnham. 1990. “Social Science Approach.” In *Dictionary of World Politics: A Reference Guide to Concepts, Ideas and Institutes*, 368–9. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Farr, James. 1995. “Remembering the Revolution: Behavioralism in American Political Science.” In *Political Science in History: Research*

- Programs and Political Traditions*, edited by James Farr, John S. Dryzek, and Stephen T. Leonard, 198–224. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Flyvberg, Bent. 2001. *Making Social Science Matter: Why Social Inquiry Fails and How it Can Succeed Again*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodin, Robert. 2009. "The State of the Discipline: The Disciplining of the State." In *Oxford Handbook of Political Science*, edited by Robert Goodin, 3–60. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gunnell, John G. 1983. "Political Theory: The Evolution of a Sub-Field." In *Political Science: The State of the Discipline*, edited by Ada W. Finifter, 4–45. Washington, D.C.: American Political Science Association.
- Gunnell, John G. 1991. "In Search of the State: Political Science as an Emerging Discipline in the U.S." In *Discourse on Society: The Shaping of the Social Science Disciplines*, edited by Peter Wagner, Bjorn Wittrock, Richard Whitley, 123–62. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gunnell, John G. 1993. *The Decent of Political Theory: The Genealogy of an American Vocation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gunnell, John G. 2015. "Pluralism and the Fate of Perestroika: A Historical Reflection." *Perspectives on Politics*, 13, no. 2: 408–15.
- Hauptmann, Emily. 2012. "The Ford Foundation and the Rise of Behavioralism in Political Science." *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 48, No. 2: 154–73.
- Hauptmann, Emily. 2017. "Evolution of Political Theory in Berkely in a Climate of Experiment and Succession." *PS*, (July): 792–6.
- Kuhn, Thomas. 1962. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- McCoy, Charles A. and John Playford, eds. 1967. *Apolitical Politics: A Critique of Behavioralism*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.
- Monroe, Kristin Renwick. 2005. *Perestroika! The Raucous Rebellion in Political Science*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Ricci, David M. 1984. *The Tragedy of Political Science: Politics, Scholarship, and Democracy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Schaar, John H. and Sheldon S. Wolin. 1963. "Essays on the Scientific Study of Politics: A Critique." *American Political Science Review*, 57, no. 1: 125–50.
- Schram, Sanford F. and Brian Caterino. 2006. *Making Political Science Matter: Debating Knowledge, Research, and Method*. New York: New York University Press.
- Seidelman, Raymond and Edward Harpham. 2015 [1985]. *Disenchanted Realists: Political Science and the American Crisis, 1884–1984*. Albany, NY: State University of New York.
- Storing, Herbert. 1962. *Essays on the Behavioral Study of Politics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Surkin, Marvin and Alan Wolfe. 1970. *An End to Political Science: The Caucus Papers*. New York: Basics Books.
- Wolin, Sheldon. 1969. "Political Theory as a Vocation." *American Political Science Review*, 63, no. 4: 1062–82.

See also

Critique of Pluralism; Disciplinary History; *New Political Science*

4. Critical theory

In 1967, critical political science gained its own self-consciousness. In response to an increasingly vapid behavioralism that claimed to be scientific but couldn't engage in any relevant way the empirical reality associated with power, exploitation, and oppression, and, energized by the panoply of radical and revolutionary voices gaining traction globally, the Caucus for a New Political Science (CNPS) unleashed a warning shot across the bow of mainstream American Political Science. Proclaiming the need, "in a radically critical spirit," for scholarship to be relevant for understanding "our great social crises," CNPS let it be known that certain political scientists would no longer play the staid role of value-neutral scholars and would instead deeply commit themselves to unerring critique and radical transformation.

Of course, critical political science did not begin with CNPS. Not only did the early years of the discipline of American political science already have incisive practitioners of critical political analysis (Charles Beard, for instance), but one could argue such a critical spirit goes all the way back to the earliest ruminations of the Greeks. Importantly, for our topic at hand, it has always been existing in the variegated tradition known as critical theory. "Critical theory" is the name given to a panoply of theoretical and political traditions that give precedence to the uncovering of historical conditions of oppression, exploitation, or injustice with the concomitant attempt to unerringly look for possible pathways of resistance and liberation. In this respect, critical theory is intimately *political* theory, that is, it assumes that its theoretical commitments are not just in interpreting the political world, but, as is famously rendered in Marx's Eleventh Thesis in his *Theses on Feuerbach* (1978), in bringing about deep political transformations in the world that can help alleviate alienation, exploitation, and injustice. It is famously associated with the unique vision associated with the Frankfurt School (where the term was consciously promoted, and in which today is usually rendered in caps, "Critical Theory"), where, particularly in terms of theorists such as Max Horkheimer, Herbert Marcuse, and Theodor Adorno, the task was to clearly portray the vast array of institutions and practices that

were hindering the flourishing of human beings in light of the unused potentialities for bringing about the betterment of human beings.

In the famous early theoretical manifesto of the Frankfurt School, "Traditional and Critical Theory" (1937), Max Horkheimer proclaimed the necessity of rethinking the direction in which theory was moving in the context of the then circulating intellectual traditions of phenomenology, sociology of knowledge, neo-Kantianism, pragmatism, and positivism. For Horkheimer, while the theoretical terrain associated with the 1930s seemed diverse and possibly open to radical directions and progressive articulations, it ultimately conspired to reinforce the socio-economic status quo in which human beings were controlled by the very practices they created and continued to recreate. In this sense, what was thus necessary was a clear demarcation between "traditional" theory and "critical" theory. Much of the former mode of theorizing was becoming dominant within the social sciences, in which there was an increasing commitment to apply the scientific method to the study of society. This commitment meant that one was primarily concerned with the proffering of hypotheses that were to then be tested against the "facts" of social life, with the hope of gaining increasing knowledge of the law-like and structural conditions of human life. Moreover, such a discourse could only justify itself if there was a commitment to value-neutrality. It is only "critical theory" – which draws upon Marx's critique of political economy but does not slavishly imitate it – that can adequately respond to the disabling articulations of the scientific "savants" that populate our academies, and which continue to haunt the hallowed halls of social science departments today. While these institutional characters assiduously collect facts, build hypotheses inductively, and then confirm their theories in light of more facts, a critical theorist "never aims simply at an increase of knowledge as such. Its goal is man's emancipation from slavery" (Horkheimer 1972b, 209).

Moreover, what the "savants" of traditional theory have practiced is at times an unconscious, and at other times a self-conscious, distanciation between their theorizing and the world of political struggles, even if, as we are clearly aware today in our discipline, the proposed object of study is politics itself.

To proclaim “value neutrality” means that at the very most one accepts the political nature of one’s “conjectures,” but after that initial process of hypothesis-derivation and theory-building one needs to stick to the facts, and only the facts as they present themselves outside the subject who is testing and theorizing. Such a radical separation between one’s theorizing and the socio-political world that one wishes to study, and in which the theorist produces his/her theory, entails two forms of distortion for a critical theorist: first, it assumes that one’s own theorizing is not a part of the reproduction of the social world in which one theorizes, and thereby it eschews its intimate ties to the conditions of power and exploitation that constantly circulate within that context (and, possibly, its connection to pathways of resistance and liberation); second, in ignoring its socio-political embeddedness, it helps to reproduce the very conditions of passivity and impotence that it inscribes in the very structure of its methodological precepts.

Critical theory, practice, and political struggle

Since Horkheimer’s initial proclamation of the need for critical theory (or, at least, a renewed sense of its importance for the time in which Horkheimer was writing), this theoretical discourse has not stood still, and is flourishing as much as traditional theory did back in the 1930s. As a discourse that is empirical, practical, and normative in its general commitments, and which embeds within its conceptual purview the attempt to both understand the conditions of oppression and exploitation and the possibilities that inhere within each historical period for human emancipation, critical theory has exploded throughout theory landscape in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. This is not just a claim about the particular tradition associated with Horkheimer and other members of the Frankfurt School (no matter which generation), but also speaks to the more general lineage of those traditions which abide by the intention to engage in the critique of some form of practice for the sake of human emancipation, which can include traditions (e.g., the left Nietzscheanism of Foucault and Deleuze) whose substantive positions are oftentimes in direct opposition to the Frankfurt School (see Macdonald

2015). Thus, the world of critical theory is actually a world of seemingly many critical theories. Or, at the very least, critical theory as a discourse is multiple in its enactments, given it embeds within its metatheoretical assumptions a notion of historicity, a consistent militant tension with the powers that be (which, of course, is always fluctuating though stable as capitalism), and an unerring commitment to social and political transformation in the name of human happiness and justice.

In a companion piece to Horkheimer’s manifesto, Herbert Marcuse (1968, 142) argues that the nature of “critical theory” becomes particularly acute in the context of its historical disjoint from the political actors for which it was written. In the nineteenth century, of course, there was an apparent close connection between critical theory and the actual political actions and discourses of the working class. Thus, Marx could feasibly assume that his critique of capitalism and his heralding of communism were not abstract and utopian but eminently empirical and practical, embedded, as they were, in the trajectories of working class antagonisms. As Marx and Engels (1978, 162) noted famously: “We call communism the *real* movement which abolishes the present state of things.” In this context, where theory and practice were clearly linked, we might then be able to understand the inherent optimism associated with Marx’s famous eleventh thesis in *Theses on Feuerbach* (1978, 145): “The philosophers have only *interpreted* the world, in various ways; the point, however, is to change it.”

In a different political context in which the importance of theory itself becomes supremely significant for critical theory given the ebbing of radical political actors, we may then see the reason for Horkheimer’s particular focus in his seminal essay, “Traditional and Critical Theory.” Famously, the essay begins with a rather straightforward question: “What is ‘theory’?” From hence, we are given an early, rather extensive, conceptualization of traditional theory, particularly that which is driven by the positivist attempt to build inductive hypotheses that will then be continually tested against the facts of social life. For traditional theory, the point is always to realize that “[t]he real validity of the theory depends on the derived propositions being consonant with the actual facts ... In relation

to facts, therefore, theory remains a hypothesis" (Horkheimer 1972a, 188). In the social sciences which have become influenced and increasingly dominated by notions associated with traditional theory, the very methods themselves seem to point to deeper social conditions and practices:

The assiduous collection of facts in all disciplines dealing with social life, the gathering of great masses of details in connection with problems, the empirical inquiries, through careful questionnaires and other means, which are a major part of scholarly activity, especially in the Anglo-Saxon universities since Spencer's time—all this adds up to a pattern which is, outwardly, much like the rest of life in a society dominated by industrial production techniques (Horkheimer 1972a, 190–91).

Of course, over eighty years on from Horkheimer's characterization we see these very same practices percolating throughout the discipline of political science, only now with added methodological armory, mathematical sophistication, and multi-scalar big data collections. But, for Horkheimer, he quickly realized that while these attempts at creating a "scientific" orientation toward politics and society were the most socially rewarded of the new forms of traditional theory, there were other approaches that engendered the same social and political function as their scientific or positivistic brethren. And, particularly problematic in this respect, were those theories whose genealogies lay within the tradition of critical theory itself. For Horkheimer (1972a, 209), this is particularly the case with the sociology of knowledge position associated with Karl Mannheim.

But, in what way is traditional theory, in all its guises, problematic? Of course, we need to be clear that Horkheimer was not attacking traditional theory because of its empirical commitments *per se*. Indeed, seeing Marx's work as an example, critical theory would have to unerringly draw upon historical and empirical analyses in its attempt to understand the world and perceive its inherent potentialities for radical change. What this implies, though, is a critical empiricism which is guided by the commitment to radical transformation, and which assumes it performs a role in that very transformation itself. In opposition to critical theory, tradi-

tional theory ultimately performs a radical distinction between the subject and object, value and fact, and thereby initiates a stance of passivity toward the unfolding of the social and political world. But, in actual fact, traditional theory is linked in two interrelated ways to the society in which it is practiced: first, it is part of the division of labor and productive forces of that society, and thus provides an important support for the conditions of exploitation and oppression that inhere within bourgeois society; and, second, in assuming its separation from that society it continually obfuscates the true social forces and power of human kind in creating the world in which they exist. As Horkheimer (1972a, 207) clarifies in a passage in which the concept of critical theory begins to be more clearly articulated:

the critical attitude of which we are speaking is wholly distrustful of the rules of conduct with which society as presently constituted provides each of its members. The separation between individual and society in virtue of which the individual accepts as natural the limits prescribed for his activity is relativized in critical theory. The latter considers the overall framework which is conditioned by the blind interaction of individual activities (that is, the existent division of labor and the class distinctions) to be a function which originates in human action and therefore is a possible object of playful decision and rational determination of goals.

From what we have uncovered already in Horkheimer's discussion of the binary opposition between traditional theory and critical theory, the latter only begins to be illuminated after the social conditions of traditional theory are elucidated and clarified. Thus, we begin to see these qualities and foci articulated as defining critical theory: it aims its analysis at the social totality; while it arises from within the bourgeois life-world, it never aims at a better functioning of that life-world; indeed, its primary quality is to be "suspicious of the very categories of better, useful, appropriate, productive, and valuable, as these are understood in the present order, and refuses to take them as non-scientific propositions about which one can do nothing" (Horkheimer 1972a, 207).

In approaching the current social world suspiciously, critical theory is continuously and militantly at odds with the existing society. Thus, it unerringly pierces through

the stated and proclaimed pretensions of a society's institutions, and looks at how they live up to the empirically-grounded inherent potentialities nurtured within that society itself. Such an appraisal is performed by assuming two important facets and conditions: first, that while society presents itself as a ready-made, law-like structure, whose existence is extrinsic to the individual, in actual fact, as Horkheimer clarified, such structures are the products of human activity and can thereby be changed and transformed. Second, that the possibilities for the rational construction of a new society which opens up the space of critique are "immanent in human work but are not correctly grasped by individuals or the common mind" (Horkheimer 1972a, 213).

As Horkheimer (1972a, 218) further clarifies, in always questioning current practices via the way in which potentialities for the alleviation of oppression and exploitation are denied or unused, critical theory

appears, to prevailing modes of thought, to be subjective and speculative, one-sided and useless. Since it runs counter to prevailing habits of thought, which contribute to the persistence of the past and carry on the business of an outdated order of things (both past and outdated order guaranteeing a faction-ridden world), it appears to be biased and unjust.

What then should critical theory do? And, it is in this register that the practical dimension to this mode of theorizing becomes clearer. Its primary purpose is to keep a space of negation open for the possibility of future action. And, for Horkheimer, this entails critically opposing forms of discourse which would reinforce the terrible context of exploitation, not to mention the unthinking acceptance of the powers that be. Like critical political science, one must continually be vigilant against the way in which dominant methodologies (be they quantitative or qualitative or seemingly radical) reinforce exploitation and oppression.

Critical theory and critical political science

To strive for a state of affairs in which there will be no exploitation or oppression, in which an all-embracing subject, namely self-aware mankind, exists ... —to strive for all this is not

yet to bring it to pass. The transmission of the critical theory in its strictest possible form is, of course, a condition of its historical success. (Horkheimer 1972a, 241)

As should be apparent in our discussion of Horkheimer's now classic essay on the nature and commitments of critical theory, the difference between "traditional theory" and "critical theory" is not really centered around the binary opposition between empirically grounded analysis and theoretically informed conceptualizations, nor, for that matter, is it solely focused on different modes of theorization *per se*, irrespective of the monikers that Horkheimer used in his discussion. Rather, the difference between these two different species of analysis and conceptualization is fundamentally political. Does one's analysis and conceptualization merely reinforce the status quo by assuming a reified world in which one can only collect "facts" or proffer interesting interpretations, or does it, at every turn, engage in its analysis for the sake of social transformation? For sure, such a commitment is rather vague in what it implies, and is, of course, open to a wide variety of interpretations concerning what it would entail in our current context. But, and this I think is important, a critical approach continues to always gauge its practices in terms of political importance of eradicating oppression and exploitation in all its guises, and concurrently establishing historically and empirically possible practices of human emancipation, freedom, and happiness.

If we were to bring Horkheimer's concerns closer to our contemporary disciplinary context, we might gain an interesting vantage point from which to rethink the future possibilities of critical political science. Obviously, the critique of traditional theory in its positivist and neo-positivist guises should not really be anything new to someone well-versed in the history of CNPS (see Barrow 2017), and who was also around when a similar critique arose under the name of "Perestroika" in the early 2000s (see Monroe 2005). Both the Caucus and the Perestroika movement attacked mainstream institutionalized political science for its obsession with scientific and/or formal methods, a vapid form of methodolatry that obfuscated the concrete conditions of politics itself and ensured against the transmission of important knowledge that could be useful in political life. Indeed,

today's political science is more methodologically ecumenical and pluralistic, and it takes more seriously the need to link research to public concerns and issues. In 1961, in the heyday of the positivist onslaughts sweeping through the social sciences, Robert Dahl (1961) could speak assuredly about the way the "protest" movement of behavioralism had now become the dominant ethos of political science, synonymous with the study of politics per se. I think we can say, on the whole, that there is now a more variegated methodological and conceptual apparatus associated with the discipline, and the Perestroika movement was instrumental in bringing this to the fore in the twenty-first century. In a sense, we could now write the epitaph to this movement as Dahl did for behavioralism, given it has increasingly become the norm for how we practice political science.

But, I would argue, true critical political science is about a lot more than methodological pluralism, getting a better picture of politics (unmediated by mathematical symbols or formal modelling or game-theoretic plays), or living up to a vague commitment to nurture knowledge that can help in the functioning of a democratic polity. Or, it should be. To proclaim those important and necessary transformations to the study of politics as one's core commitments could potentially consign this important intellectual and disciplinary project to another form of "traditional theory." As is well-known, the Caucus forged its insurgent message in the turbulent period of the 1960s and 1970s, in which revolution and rebellion were circulating within very sinews of society on a global scale. If we were to draw upon the analysis of Horkheimer, we could say that what the Caucus heralded within its initial foray into the discipline were the radical goals of critical theory itself: it was a clarion call for constant suspicion of the status quo in the discipline and in society itself; it unashamedly articulated the political importance of ending oppression, exploitation, and dehumanization; and, it constantly attempted to talk of the possibility of, and need for, human liberation and emancipation. These are the goals that we need to reinvest in and recommit to today in our practicing of critical political science. Of course, one

can't assume that such a recommitment and reinvestment will be easy, nor that it will necessarily take the same form as proffered by a Horkheimer in the 1930s or a Caucus member in the 1960s. If we truly want to have relevance today (both for the discipline and for our global society), we need to take seriously this critical dimension and attitude so eloquently promoted by a Horkheimer in our tasks as critical political scientists.

BRADLEY J. MACDONALD

References

- Barrow, Clyde. 2017. "The Political and Intellectual Origins of New Political Science." *New Political Science* 39, no. 4: 437–72.
- Dahl, Robert. 1961. "The Behavioral Approach in Political Science: Epitaph for a Monument to a Successful Protest." *American Political Science Review* 55, no. 4: 763–72.
- Horkheimer, Max. 1972a. "Traditional and Critical Theory." In *Critical Theory: Selected Essays*, translated by M. O'Connell, 188–243. New York: Herder and Herder.
- Horkheimer, Max. 1972b. "Postscript." In *Critical Theory: Selected Essays*, translated by M. O'Connell, 244–52. New York: Herder and Herder.
- Macdonald, Bradley J. 2015. "Critical Theory." In *Encyclopedia of Political Thought*, edited by Michael Gibbons, 782–9. New York: Blackwell-Wiley.
- Macdonald, Bradley J. 2017. "Traditional and Critical Theory Today: Toward a Critical Political Science." *New Political Science* 39, no. 4: 511–22.
- Marcuse, Herbert. 1968. "Philosophy and Critical Theory." In *Negations: Essays in Critical Theory*, translated by Jeremy Shapiro, 134–58. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Marx, Karl. 1978. *Theses on Feuerbach*. In *The Marx-Engels Reader*, edited by Robert Tucker, 143–5. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. 1978. *The German Ideology*. In *The Marx-Engels Reader*, edited by Robert Tucker, 147–200. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Monroe, Kristen Renwick, ed. 2005. *Perestroika!: The Raucous Rebellion in Political Science*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

See also

Herbert Marcuse; Andre Gorz; Reification; Commodity Fetishism

5. Ideology critique

A critical political science, if it is to be both critical and a science, must overcome what is often referred to as the “fact-value distinction”; a view that is traceable to David Hume (2007, 302), who argued it is impossible to derive critical conclusions – regarding what *ought* or *ought not* to be – from scientific premises, which concern what *is*, *was*, or perhaps *will be*. The approach to “ideology critique” outlined in this chapter bridges that gap by grounding claims about how the world ought to be in an account of how the world is and came to be that way.

Historical materialism

The account of ideology critique that I will offer here is grounded in the work of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, and specifically in their *historical materialism*, a philosophical position that, amongst other things, offers a distinctive account of how our ideas – our understanding of the non-human world, our theories of right and wrong, our views on art and religion – are related to the material circumstances in which we live. Marx and Engels developed this account as an alternative to Hegel’s monist philosophical idealism. While Hegel saw in the political and intellectual history of human societies the unfolding and realization of Absolute Spirit according to its own, immanent logic, Marx and Engels offered a more mundane perspective: “men, developing their material production and their material intercourse, alter, along with this their real existence, their thinking and the products of their thinking” (Marx and Engels 2010, Vol. 5, 37). In other words, humans come to know the world as they work in it and on it, and what they come to know is closely related to the kind of world they live in and the kind of work they do. This means that knowledge about the world will vary from place to place and will change over time in a manner that can be explained by reference to the different ways that people make the things that they need and want.

This applies equally to ideas about social life. Generally speaking, humans do not work on the world alone, but in dense networks of structured interaction with others. Norms and institutions that predate any individual person’s birth shape the roles they will occupy

within a social division of labor, the forms and amount of recompense they can expect from their work, and the activities they can pursue in their leisure. Like knowledge of the non-human world, then, prevalent beliefs about the origins and purposes of social institutions, appropriate individual behavior, or just distributions of the benefits and burdens of cooperation will all vary both across societies and within societies in relation to differences in the overall organization of social life and the different positions that groups occupy within any given mode of organization.

Thus, in their early work, Marx and Engels did not simply reject idealism in favor of historical materialism. They offered a historical materialist explanation for *why*, despite its deficiencies, idealism dominated German intellectual life, arguing that its characteristic abstraction reflected the relative underdevelopment of industrial production in Germany, vis-à-vis France and England. They also argued, against other young German intellectuals, that philosophical argument alone could not advance the state of philosophical understanding in Germany. “The criticism of the speculative philosophy of law turns, not towards itself, but towards *problems* which can only be solved by one means – *practice*” (Marx and Engels, 2010, Vol. 3, 181). Only by changing the material circumstances within which Germans lived and worked could Germans change the ways they thought.

In any society with a complex division of labor, different groups of people experienced the same social institutions in ways that were not simply different, but in a sense *opposed*, because the institutions in question allotted lighter burdens and greater benefits to one class or a few classes by imposing heavier burdens and smaller benefits on others. It would seem to follow that if different classes within a society have opposed experiences of social institutions, they should form opposed ideas about those institutions, leading to conflict between classes and, perhaps, revolution and institutional change. Alongside technological advances, conflict arising from the opposed interests of classes is the fundamental mechanism of institutional and intellectual change in Marx and Engels’ historical materialism.

But Marx and Engels did not think that our experiences of social institutions always cause us to form accurate ideas about them. On the contrary, they argued that in times of

normal – that is, not-revolutionary – politics, prevalent ideas about the institutions that structure class divisions were systematically distorted, and they used a particular term to describe these distorted ideas: “ideology” (Marx and Engels 2010, Vol. 5, 36).

How ideologies work

Ideologies are prevalent modes of thinking that arise from within class-divided societies and that conceal and misrepresent their class divisions, leading people to misunderstand their own societies. Effective ideologies encourage the complacent acceptance or enthusiastic support of institutions that structure class divisions, even or especially by classes that experience relative disadvantage from those institutions. In this way, ideologies have important historical consequences. They suppress class conflicts and stabilize hierarchical social orders, perpetuating the advantageous position of the class or classes that benefit from the existing institutional order.

This is what Marx and Engels meant when they asserted, famously, that the “ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas” (Marx and Engels 2010, Vol. 5, 59). Hierarchical social orders endow the members of advantaged classes with both means and motive to produce ideologies that legitimize and thus stabilize the social order. Advantaged classes can employ the material surpluses they extract to give time and resources to intellectuals to articulate and disseminate their own ideas about existing institutions. This capacity to influence how the members of a society think, and thus to sustain a social order by means of something more than brute force, is what makes an *advantaged* class a *ruling* class.

In some cases, ruling class intellectuals might use the resources at their disposal to intentionally obscure reality and deceive their audiences, but for the purposes of ideology critique, these are the least interesting ideologies. Rather, the important critical insight that comes from historical materialism is that the perspective of members of the ruling class on the social order in which they live will necessarily be a partial and limited one, defined by a particular experience of social institutions, and especially the institutions that shape class divisions. Ideologies are not *lies*. Rather, they view the world as characterized by

two specific *distortions*: universalization and naturalization.

Universalization involves misrepresenting features of a social order that deliver selective advantages to a particular subset of the population as if they were equally beneficial to society as a whole. This has the effect of legitimizing the status quo and making efforts to reform social institutions appear undesirable, because reforms would threaten a general social interest in preserving the universal advantages enjoyed under the reigning system. *Naturalization* involves misrepresenting contingent features of a social order that arose at a determinate historical moment as if they were inevitable features of an unchanging, natural way of ordering human societies. This has the effect of making efforts to change those features appear deeply misguided, or even impossible, because adopting alternative arrangements would transgress upon or fail to acknowledge some ineradicable characteristic of human nature.

In *Capital*, Marx showed that both of these forms of ideological distortion were present in his contemporaries’ accounts of the freedom enjoyed by individuals in capitalist societies. In a society where no one is enslaved or enserfed, the thinking went, everyone is free. In capitalist societies, laborers work for a wage, at a rate and under conditions that both employer and employee have freely agreed to. Marx did not deny that there was some truth in this account or denigrate the appeal to freedom as empty rhetoric. The legal status that distinguishes a wage laborer from a slave or a serf is not a fiction or a negligible feature of life in capitalist societies, but nor is it the only feature relevant to understanding individual freedom in capitalist societies. Capitalist institutions made laborers free in what Marx sardonically called a “double sense” (Marx 2010, Vol. 35, 179). Laborers were freed from the masters and lords that oppressed their ancestors, but they were also freed of any productive capital of their own. Though they are not compelled to work for any particular firm, then, because they are unable to purchase the raw materials and machinery, they would be required to earn a living on their own, laborers in a capitalist society are obliged, on the pain of starvation, to work for some firm. Upon reaching adulthood, or even earlier, laborers encounter the “free market” as an inescapable fate. Thus, in capitalist societies, legal freedom

for all is accompanied by a specific kind of economic compulsion for most. An account of freedom that considers only legal freedom misrepresents capitalist social institutions, concealing its class divisions and making freedom appear universal.

At the same time, Marx emphasized that there was nothing *natural* about capitalist social institutions. “Nature does not produce on the one side owners of money or commodities, and on the other men possessing nothing but their own labor power.” The specific and unequal distribution of wealth that underpins capitalism’s double freedom, is, rather, “the result of a past historical development, the product of many economic revolutions, of the extinction of a whole series of older forms of social production” (Marx 2010, Vol. 35, 179). Alternatives to capitalism are possible and, perhaps, desirable, but the ideology that misrepresents capitalist societies as free societies corresponding to a natural order makes it difficult to imagine and endorse alternative modes of ordering our social lives, or to take action to pursue reform. Ideology critique clears the way.

The components of ideology critique

We have already seen, in Marx and Engels’ critique of German idealism and in Marx’s critique of capitalist freedom, the first steps in ideology critique. Ideology critique begins by giving an account – a historical explanation supported by appropriate evidence – of how material circumstances have shaped some set of prevalent ideas about the existing social order. This account must demonstrate that the ideas in question constitute an ideology in the sense just described. That is to say, it must demonstrate, first, that this mode of thinking reflects the limited perspective of a class that derives advantages from an existing social order, and second, that the prevalence of this mode of thinking helps to stabilize that order by concealing or misrepresenting its hierarchies and divisions, making selective advantages appear universal and inequalities appear natural.

To identify ideological universalization and naturalization within prevalent ideas about a social order, ideology critique incorporates two critical approaches to which it is sometimes contrasted. First, the work of exposing distorted universalization is done

by what Michael Walzer (1987) has called an “internal” or “connected” critic: a member of the social order whose own thinking has been shaped by the prevalent ideas in question, who takes the universalist pretensions of the social order’s intellectual defenders seriously, but who gains “critical distance” from the order and its ideologies through some direct experience or observation of the ways that the order actually fails to deliver the universal advantages its defenders claim. The standard against which the critic measures society and finds it wanting is not a theory of justice based in divine revelation or a thought experiment, but claims that have been articulated, presumably sincerely, by defenders of the social order. The internal critic demands, in effect, that the social order should become what ruling class intellectuals claim it already is.

Second, the work of exposing distorted naturalization involves a form of critical argument pioneered by Jean-Jacques Rousseau and described by later philosophers as “genealogy” (Neuhouser 2012). In his *Second Discourse*, Rousseau addressed a question similar to the one we saw Marx address in *Capital*, but pitched at a higher level of generality, namely, “what is the origin of inequality among men?” In response, Rousseau offers a “hypothetical and conditional” – though amply footnoted – history of the human species’ transition from a peaceful solitary existence to a fractious social one. The purpose of this exercise is to establish that the inequality, egocentrism, and oppression that characterize supposedly “civil” societies are in no sense *natural*. Inequality is rather an outcome of a particular series of contingent historical events. “The first man,” Rousseau (1997, 161) writes, “who, having enclosed a piece of ground, to whom it occurred to say *this is mine*, and found people sufficiently simple to believe him, was the true founder of civil society.” Crucially, Rousseau’s genealogy determines the origins not only of society’s unequal distribution of wealth, prestige, and power, but also of the ideologies that legitimize them. He calls his “founder of civil society” an “imposter,” imagining a counterfactual history in which the founder’s audience had rejected his specious claim, pulled up his fenceposts, filled in his ditches, and continued living without private property of any kind. By showing that history could have been different, Rousseau

argues that human societies are not fated to live forever in the unequal social orders that they do. We are free to revise the norms and institutions that structure our experiences.

Internal and genealogical critiques begin the work of ideology critique, but they do not and cannot complete it. These approaches unveil ideological distortion, revealing aspects of a hierarchical social order that were concealed or misrepresented by prevalent modes of thinking. But they don't do what a critical political science must do, grounding claims about how the social order ought or ought not to be in an account of how the social order is and came to be. An effective genealogical critique, like Rousseau's, "problematizes" the social order to which it is applied, opening it to theorization and investigation that would otherwise have been precluded by ideology (Koopman 2013). It demonstrates that society need not be the way that it is, but it does not demonstrate that society should not be the way that it is, and it cannot argue that society should be some specific other way.

Internal critique can make these latter arguments, but only conditionally. The internal critic can say to his or her society that, insofar as they want their social order to actually fulfill the distorted account that ruling class intellectuals have given of it, they should alter its institutions so that they more adequately perform the functions they were supposedly designed and adopted to perform. But internal critique cannot say why a society's members *should* want their social order to better resemble what is depicted in prevailing ideologies. Ultimately, internal critique must fall back upon some version of "we should live up to our ideals because they are ours," and despite Walzer's protestations, this gives internal critique a decidedly conventionalist character (Jaeggi 2018, 186–8). Internal criticism may be effective in closing gaps between ideology and reality that are attributable to ruling class hypocrisy, but it stalls when a social order fails systematically to deliver the universal advantages its defenders claim as Marx argued was the case in capitalist societies. Marx did not call upon capitalist societies to live up to the limited standard of freedom lauded by its apologists. He demanded a fundamental revision of capitalist social institutions, abolishing private ownership of productive capital so that individuals could enjoy a more expansive form of

freedom that was pointed at, but not actually understood by the intellectual defenders of capitalism.

It is here that ideology critique moves past the genealogical and internal critiques that constitute its first steps, drawing on the specifically *historical* materialism that provides its basic framework. The extant social order and its prevailing ideologies are the outcome of a series of historical transformations – revolutions that fundamentally modified the orders that preceded them. The ideas that come constitute the ideology of a ruling class are first articulated in the heat of a revolutionary struggle led by an insurgent class, which becomes a ruling class when it wins and establishes the conditions upon which it will rule. Marx and Engels assert that "each new class which puts itself in the place of one ruling before it is compelled, merely in order to carry through its aim, to present its interest as the common interest of all the members of society, ... it has to give its ideas the form of universality" (Marx and Engels 2010, Vol. 5, 60). They did not, however, dismiss this universalization as presumption or obfuscation. Rather, they argued in periods of social transformation, the interest of the class leading the revolution "really is as yet mostly connected with the common interest of all other non-ruling classes" (Marx and Engels, Vol. 5, 61). Universalization first arises out of the material necessity of building a revolutionary coalition that can carry out a program of social transformation.

Thus, universalist ideas that originate as revolutionary aspirations *become* ideological only after a revolution has succeeded and a new ruling class aims to perpetuate the selective advantages that its members derive from the new social order. But history is not a directionless cycle of revolutionary upheaval and ideological stagnation. Rather, "every new class ... achieves domination only on a broader basis than that of the class ruling previously" (Marx and Engels 2010, Vol. 5, 61). Revolutionary transformations of social orders do not simply replace an old ruling class with a new one. Revolutions alter social institutions that generated crises of legitimacy in the old order, replacing them with new institutions that serve a *more* general interest than their predecessors. As latter-day critical theorists have put it, revolutionary transformations lead to "social

learning” (Jaeggi 2018, 221–45) or, more controversially, “progress” (Allen 2016).

Ideology critique identifies the elements in the ideologies that it criticizes that reflect the social learning achieved in revolutionary transformations. It strips away the distorted universalization and naturalization attendant upon these ideas that impede further revolutionary transformation and social learning, clearing the way to advances that will build upon the accomplishments of the past. As Marx (2010, Vol. 3, 144) put it, “we develop new principles for the world out of the world’s own principles.” By understanding how the extant social order came to be, by identifying the fruits of historical progress embodied in existing institutions as well as the divisions and inequalities that they create, we discern how those institutions can and *ought* to be reformed, and thus make our own contributions to a world that will be inhabited, criticized, and reformed by future generations.

Toward a critical political science

This very brief account will, I hope, convince readers of the immense potential of ideology critique as a critical political science, but most readers will likely have some serious reservations. One might reasonably say that ideology critique has significant limitations both as science and as criticism. On the first front, we have seen that ideology critique involves claims about the relationship between material contexts and ideas that contemporary social scientists would recognize as causal explanations, but Marx did not support these explanations using any method of causal inference that contemporary social scientists would recognize. Rather, he summoned suggestive instances and illustrations, like his account of German idealism and Germany’s industrial underdevelopment (Marx and Engels 2010, 30).

Since Marx’s time, though, many scholars have applied the methods of their various disciplines to investigations of how social contexts shape and limit the thinking of the people situated in them, indicating a path forward for ideology critics. Philosophers and social scientists like G.A. Cohen (2000), Jon Elster (1985), Jorge Larraín (1979), and Karl Mannheim (1936) have distilled historical materialism and the theory of ideology

into clear, testable propositions. And intellectual historians and political theorists like Richard Ashcraft (1986) and Ellen Meiksins Wood (2012) have written rigorous “social histories” of canonical texts in western political philosophy, demonstrating the influence of material context and social conflict upon influential political ideas. The effectiveness of ideology critique stands or falls with the critic’s ability to rigorously support his or her description of ideas as ideology, and for this purpose contemporary social scientific and historical methods, especially the comparative method, are indispensable (Simon 2020).

On the critical side, it must be acknowledged that Marx himself fell victim to exactly the kind of ideological distortion that he so deftly analysed in his contemporaries. In particular, Marx’s historical materialism universalized and naturalized the history of western European economic development, making Marx’s own region’s contingent and particular trajectory into a standard model that other regions should be expected to follow (Anderson 2010). Marx’s account also did not take sufficient account of how interactions between European and non-European economies shaped economic development throughout what some scholars, heavily influenced by but critical of Marx have called the “capitalist world-system” (Wallerstein 1979). As the loose school of “post-colonial” thinkers, many of whom were also influenced by Marx, have shown, this way of thinking did in fact help conceal and misrepresent the hierarchies and divisions that characterized European imperialism in the Americas, Africa, and Asia, and still does serve to legitimize neo-imperial relations between western Europe, the United States, and much of the rest of the world (Chakrabarty 2000). For ideology critique to guide transformative change today, it must incorporate the critical insights of post-colonial and world-systems theory, feminist and Queer theory, ecocriticism and critical race theory, to name only a few. Ultimately, the promise of ideology critique as critical political science lies not in its capacity to produce a final, definitive account of the ideal state, but in subjecting all political institutions, the ideologies that sustain them, and the sciences that study them to relentless critical scrutiny.

JOSHUA SIMON

References

- Allen, Amy. 2016. *The End of Progress: Decolonizing the Normative Foundations of Critical Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Anderson, Kevin B. 2010. *Marx at the Margins: On Nationalism, Ethnicity, and Non-Western Societies*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Ashcraft, Richard. 1986. *Revolutionary Politics and Locke's 'Two Treatises of Government'*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2000. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Cohen, G.A. 2000. *Karl Marx's Theory of History: A Defence*. Expanded Edition. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Elster, Jon. 1985. *Making Sense of Marx*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hume, David. 2007. *A Treatise on Human Nature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jaeggi, Rahel. 2018. *Critique of Forms of Life*, translated by Ciaran Cronin. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Koopman, Colin. 2013. *Genealogy as Critique: Foucault and the Problems of Modernity*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Larraín, Jorge. 1979. *The Concept of Ideology*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Mannheim, Karl. 1936. *Ideology and Utopia*. Oxford: Routledge.
- Marx, Karl. 2010. "Contribution to Hegel's Philosophy of Law. Introduction. In *Marx-Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 3, 175–87. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Marx, Karl. 2010. "Letters from the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*." In *Marx-Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 3, 133–45. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Marx, Karl. 2010. "Capital, Volume I." In *Marx-Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 35, xiii–852. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. 2010. "The German Ideology." In *Marx-Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 5, 19–539. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Neuhouser, Frederick. 2012. "The Critical Function of Genealogy in the Thought of J.-J. Rousseau." *The Review of Politics* 74, no. 3: 371–87.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. 1997. *The Discourses and other Early Political Writings*, edited by Victor Gourevitch. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Simon, Joshua. 2020. "Institutions, Ideologies, and Comparative Political Theory." *Perspectives on Politics* 18, no. 2: 423–38.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1979. *The Capitalist World-Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wood, Ellen Meiksins. 2012. *Liberty and Property: A Social History of Western Political Thought from Renaissance to Enlightenment*. London: Verso.

6. Disciplinary history

According to mainstream political scientists, good work in the discipline is logically sound, free of bias, impersonal, and apolitical. When historians of the discipline analyse the relation of political science to the state and capitalism, however, they show how political scientists reflect, transmit, and legitimate the political culture and institutions many claim to study apolitically and objectively. By doing so, they expose the distortions and blind spots built into mainstream political scientists' understanding of their discipline. Such work constitutes a significant contribution to critical political science.

Not all histories of the discipline are critical in this way. For example, while Anna Haddow (1939) catalogues the teaching of what eventually became political science in the United States in exhaustive, bibliographic detail, she offers little analysis of what she presents. Similarly, while Baer et al.'s (1991) collection of excerpts of the oral history interviews of prominent political scientists who began their careers from the 1920s through the 1950s is an important resource for anyone interested in the discipline's history, its brief introduction does not offer a historical account of its own. Other works that offer extended historical narratives tell stories of progress, portraying a political science growing from its humble beginnings in the nineteenth century into a more technically sophisticated social science (Somit and Tanenhaus [1967] 1982). Some use their own authors' intellectual development to illustrate that progress (Eulau 1996). Each of these approaches to the history of political science has historical value. None, however, is an example of critical political science.

The earliest group of critical historians of the discipline focused on the balance political scientists tried to strike between professional standards of scientific objectivity and their own personal political commitments. They also questioned political scientists' conceptions of professionalism, science, and objectivity. Some argued that these were products of American political culture and ideology rather than universally valuable guides to political inquiry (Crick 1959; Gunnell 1993, 2004; Jacobson 1963). Others commented on political scientists' tortuous attempts to articulate their political convictions while remain-

ing loyal to these professional ideals (Gunnell 1986; Ricci 1984; Seidelman and Harpham 1985). Though they moved in somewhat different critical directions, none of these works presented political science as progressing or developing in overwhelmingly positive ways. Instead, as their titles indicated, they portrayed a political science beset by disenchantment, alienation or even tragedy.

More recently, some disciplinary historians have analysed how mainstream political science has reflected and reproduced dominant trends in U.S. politics and foreign policy. Their thoroughly critical accounts challenge dominant notions of the discipline as objective, apolitical, and non-ideological, showing how political scientists endorsed and promoted specific U.S. foreign policy aims. Among these were the U.S.'s colonial ambitions in the early twentieth century and the eugenicist racial ideas that supported them (Blatt 2018; Vitalis 2015), U.S. ideological justifications for World Wars I and II and the war in Vietnam (Oren 2003), or the late twentieth-century iteration of "democracy promotion" (Guilhot 2005; Robinson 1996). Crucially, each of these histories goes well beyond criticizing particular political scientists for their public support of U.S. foreign policy to show how the discipline's basic concepts reflected and legitimated the U.S.'s foreign policy priorities. Each shows how generations of political scientists' studies of "democracy," "international relations," or "civil society" were symbiotically linked to the ideology and policies of the U.S. foreign policy elite. The seemingly neutral concepts that political scientists use to map and divide the world into areas of study register shifts in political and economic power as well. For example, U.S. university programs devoted to the "non-Western world" after World War II changed in response to shifts in the state's foreign policy priorities rather than shifts in scholarly paradigms (Cumings 1998, 159). Along similar lines, the recent replacement of "area studies" programs with those emphasizing globalization reflected the U.S.'s post-Cold War hegemony rather than advances in social scientific knowledge (Kamola 2019, xv, 22).

While the works mentioned above focus principally on the practice of political science in the U.S., others examine how the discipline became instrumental to exercising U.S. power overseas. For example,

ties between universities in the U.S. and Indonesia, Nigeria and Chile produced international networks of elites educated in U.S. political and social science (Parmar 2012). Political scientists were extensively involved in advancing U.S. hegemony in each of these cases. Specifically, political science in Chile developed its undeniably authoritarian aspect under the Pinochet regime when its practitioners actively reformulated concepts like democracy and liberalism to justify authoritarian rule. This “authoritarian political science” in Chile, however, was profoundly “cosmopolitan,” given that many political scientists in the U.S. and elsewhere helped advance it (Ravecca 2019, 85).

Critical works like these prompt some more specific questions: how is the discipline of political science linked to powerful political and economic institutions? And how do these linkages enable these institutions to influence political science, and vice versa? Historians of the discipline have offered several distinct sets of answers to these questions. Whether their answers focus on the major funders of political science, the porous boundaries between academic political science and the political and capitalist world or the discipline’s development within the university, they are often complementary.

The funding political scientists receive from private philanthropic foundations and government sources forms one link between the discipline and centers of political and economic power. For more than a century, private and public patrons have influenced not only what political scientists study but also how they study it. Still, with the exception of exposés of 1960s military-funded programs to study insurgency and revolution (Horowitz 1967) or more recent critiques of the agendas driving major philanthropic gifts to institutions of higher education (MacLean 2017; Teles 2008), there has been little attention to the influence major funders exert on the mainstream discipline. This lack of attention severely compromises political scientists’ ability to understand their discipline critically.

Private philanthropic foundations, the oldest major patrons of academic institutions in the U.S., have provided major funding to a wide range of academic institutions and disciplines since the early twentieth century, often to advance specific political aims. For one, foundation programs have

sought to temper social scientists’ oppositional impulses by giving them incentives to provide their professional expertise to the state. Critical historians of the social sciences have highlighted this pattern in the Rockefeller Foundation’s role in creating the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) as well as in the priorities of the Russell Sage Foundation in its first decades (Fisher 1993; O’Connor 2007). Similarly, especially since the beginning of the Cold War, foundations have built international institutions and networks of academics to facilitate the U.S.’s exercise of economic and political power (Guilhot 2005; Parmar 2012). At the same time, foundation programs have also aimed to smooth some of the rough and ugly aspects of U.S. military power and capitalism to make these less vulnerable to criticism (Roelofs 2003). Though some political scientists have been involved in programs of the first kind, they (along with everyone else) are inevitably the targets of the second. The power of foundations, therefore, lies not only in steering social scientists in particular directions but also in shaping everyone’s ideas of how well “the system” is working.

Private philanthropic funding in the first part of the twentieth century also laid the groundwork for the public funding that became important later. During the early Cold War, the Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation actively worked to secure long-term federal government support for social scientific approaches they favored, including campaigning for the creation of a National Science Foundation (NSF) that would support the social sciences (Hauptmann 2016; Solovey 2013). A political science program was among the last established at the NSF; still, from the 1970s on, the NSF has been by far political scientists’ largest source of publicly reported government funding (Solovey 2020, 90–100; 308). As a result, when members of Congress periodically threaten to cut or even eliminate this funding, many political scientists fear for their future research careers.

Although NSF funding for political science has been both crucial and unstable, there are few historical studies of it – and none is by a political scientist. Still, it is clear that NSF funding has disproportionately favored only some fields in the discipline and only some approaches within those fields. For example, the NSF has long supported the

creation and maintenance of large, cumulative datasets and research projects that rely on them. One such dataset, the American National Election Studies (ANES), is the largest ongoing NSF commitment to political science (Hauptmann 2020, 103). The NSF has also favored research that furthers the U.S.'s military power, as indicated by its participation in the Minerva Initiative, a 2008 Department of Defense program designed to support research related to the "War on Terror" (Rohde 2013, 153–4). More recently, when the NSF discontinued its Political Science program in 2020, it directed political scientists towards two newly created topical programs: "Accountable Institutions and Behavior" and "Security and Preparedness." Like the Minerva Initiative, the latter also focuses on research with military and intelligence applications.¹

Closely related to studies of funding is another body of critical historical work that examines the highly porous borders between professional political science and state agencies, private foundations, NGOs, political campaigns, consulting firms, and commercial pollsters. For one, many well-known political scientists have crossed over into these other realms while keeping some ties to their academic positions. The repeated shuttling back and forth on the part of these "double agents" binds academic political science ever more closely to those other territories to which the discipline's most prominent representatives often travel (Guilhot 2005). Approaches and techniques first developed outside academic political science also crossed formal academic borders repeatedly and easily, as histories of the rise of rational choice theory, survey research and political communication research in political science all show (Amadae 2003; Converse 1987; Simpson 1994). Finally, the existence of complex hybrid institutions that are both academic and governmental or political/commercial provides yet more evidence of the permeable border between political science, the state, and capital. Research organizations, like the Special Operations Research Office (SORO), housed in universities but funded by the military, occupied this "gray area" (Rohde 2013), as do so-called non-governmental organizations, like Freedom House, that receive the lion's share of their funding from the U.S. government (Zerndt 2016). In each of these ways, academic political science has been

continually subject to the influence of powerful political and economic institutions outside its formally recognized boundaries.

Finally, of all the institutions that have influenced the historical development of political science, the university is among the most enduringly important. Political scientists, along with sociologists and economists, petitioned for admittance to U.S. universities in the latter half of the nineteenth century by characterizing themselves as dispassionate professionals with advanced degrees rather than crusading social reformers criticizing industrial capitalism (Furner 1975; Ross 1991). Nevertheless, university leaders made clear that these new faculty were not to advocate for political causes these leaders themselves did not support or criticize prominent alumni and donors. Those who did so were fired and found that, as "at will" employees, they had few if any legal remedies. When the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) formed in 1915 to assert the independent standing of the academic profession, it sought not only the power to bargain collectively with university boards and administrations but also the academic freedom it claimed was essential to fulfilling the profession's educational aims (Kaufman-Osborn 2017). Although the formation of the AAUP undoubtedly improved professors' standing and job security, it also strengthened its members' ties to the established political and economic orders without giving them much say in them (Barrow 1990; Kaufman-Osborn 2017).

In the U.S. after World War II, university-based research increased quickly and dramatically. Projects in the natural and physical sciences (many with military applications) made up most of this increase; still, some projects in the social sciences also received significant external support (Geiger 1993). The availability of this new source of income and prestige prompted many universities to reward successful grant-winners on their faculty and push for hiring more of them. In political science, this meant that approaches most favored by the foundations and the newly created NSF were also most likely to be favored by university leaders. As a result, the power university administrations exerted over the hiring and tenure of political scientists further contributed to the mid-twentieth century prominence of foundation- and government-funded

approaches like behavioralism, survey research, and area studies (Lowen 1997; Hauptmann 2020).

Critical disciplinary histories reveal long-standing connections between academic political science and centers of political and economic power. They therefore deepen critiques of contemporary political science.

EMILY HAUPTMANN

Note

1. https://nsf.gov/funding/pgm_summ.jsp?pims_id=505712&org=SBE&from=home.

References

- Amadae, Sonja M. 2003. *Rationalizing Capitalist Democracy: The Cold War Origins of Rational Choice Liberalism*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Baer, M. A., Jewell, M.E. and Sigelman, L. (Eds.). 1991. *Political Science in America: Oral Histories of a Discipline*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 1990. *Universities and the Capitalist State: Corporate Liberalism and the Reconstruction of American Higher Education*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Blatt, Jessica. 2018. *Race and the Making of American Political Science*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Converse, Jean. 1987. *Survey Research in the United States: Roots and Emergence, 1890–1960*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Crick, Bernard. 1959. *The American Science of Politics: Its Origins and Conditions*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cummings, Bruce. 1998. “Boundary Displacement: Area Studies and International Studies During and After the Cold War.” In *Universities and Empire: Money and Politics in the Social Sciences During the Cold War*, edited by Christopher Simpson. New York: The New Press.
- Eulau, Heinz. 1996. *Micro-macro Dilemmas in Political Science: Personal Pathways through Complexity*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Fisher, Donald. 1993. *Fundamental Development of the Social Sciences: Rockefeller Philanthropy and the Social Science Research Council*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Furner, Mary O. 1975. *Advocacy & Objectivity. A Crisis in the Professionalization of American Social Science, 1865–1905*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.
- Geiger, Roger L. 1993. *Research and Relevant Knowledge: American Research Universities since World War II*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Guilhot, Nicolas. 2005. *The Democracy Makers: Human Rights and the Politics of Global Order*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gunnell, John G. 1986. *Between Philosophy and Politics: The Alienation of Political Theory*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Gunnell, John G. 1993. *The Descent of Political Theory: The Genealogy of an American Vocation*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Gunnell, John G. 2004. *Imagining the American Polity: Political Science and the Discourse of Democracy*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Haddow, Anna. 1939. *Political Science in American Colleges and Universities, 1636–1900*. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, Inc.
- Hauptmann, Emily. 2016. “Propagandists for the Behavioral Sciences: The Overlooked Partnership between the Carnegie Corporation and SSRC in the Mid-Twentieth Century.” *Journal of the Behavioral Sciences* 52, no. 2: 167–87.
- Hauptmann, Emily. 2020. “Why They Shared: Recovering Early Arguments for Sharing Social Scientific Data.” *Science in Context* 33: 101–19.
- Horowitz, Irving L, ed. 1967. *The Rise and Fall of Project Camelot*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Jacobson, Norman. 1963. “Political Science and Political Education.” *American Political Science Review* 57, no 3: 561–9.
- Kamola, Isaac. 2019. *Making the World Global: U.S. Universities and the Production of the Global Imaginary*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- Kaufman-Osborn, Timothy. 2017. “Disenchanted Professionals: The Politics of Faculty Governance in the Neoliberal Academy.” *Perspectives on Politics* 15, no. 1: 100–15.
- Lowen, Rebecca. 1997. *Creating the Cold War University: The Transformation of Stanford*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- MacLean, Nancy. 2017. *Democracy in Chains: The Deep History of the Radical Right’s Stealth Plan for America*. New York: Penguin.
- O’Connor, Alice. 2007. *Social Science for What? Philanthropy and the Social Question in a World Turned Rightside Up*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Oren, Ido. 2003. *Our Enemies and US: America’s Rivalries and the Making of Political Science*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Parmar, Inderjeet. 2012. *Foundations of the American Century: The Ford, Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations in the Rise of American Power*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ravecca, Paulo. 2019. *The Politics of Political Science. Re-writing Latin American Experiences*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Ricci, David M. 1984. *The Tragedy of Political*

- Science: Politics, Scholarship and Democracy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Robinson, William. 1996. *Promoting Polyarchy: Globalization, US Intervention and Hegemony*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roelofs, Joan. 2003. *Foundations and Public Policy: The Mask of Pluralism*. Albany, New York: SUNY Press.
- Rohde, Joy. 2013. *Armed with Expertise: The Militarization of American Social Research During the Cold War*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Ross, Dorothy. 1991. *The Origins of American Social Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seidelman, Raymond with Edward J. Harpham. 1985. *Disenchanted Realists: Political Science and the American Crisis, 1884–1984*. Albany, N.Y.: SUNY Press.
- Simpson, Christopher. 1994. *Science of Coercion: Communication Research and Psychological Warfare, 1945–1960*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Solovey, Mark. 2013. *Shaky Foundations. The Politics-Patronage-Social Science Nexus in Cold War America*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Solovey, Mark. 2020. *Social Science for What? Battles over Public Funding for the “Other Sciences” at the National Science Foundation*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
- Somit, Albert and Joseph Tanenhaus. [1967] 1982. *The Development of American Political Science: From Burgess to Behaviorism*. New York: Irvington.
- Teles, Steven M. 2008. *The Rise of the Conservative Legal Movement: The Battle for Control of the Law*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Vitalis, Robert. 2015. *White World Order, Black Power Politics: The Birth of International Relations*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Zerndt, Emily A. 2016. *The House that Propaganda Built: Historicizing the Democracy Promotion Efforts and Measurement Tools of Freedom House*. Ph.D. diss., Western Michigan University.

Further readings

- Adcock, Robert. 2014. *Liberalism and the Emergence of American Political Science: A Transatlantic Tale*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Farr, James and Raymond Seidelman, eds. 1993. *Discipline and History. Political Science in the United States*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

See also

- Academic Repression; Critical University Studies; Power Structure Analysis

Section I: Marxism

7. Analytical Marxism

Introduction

In 1978, *Karl Marx's Theory of History: A Defence* appears, in which G.A. Cohen (1978, ix) reconstructs historical materialism guided only by "two constraints: on the one hand, what Marx wrote, and, on the other, those standards of clarity and rigour which distinguish twentieth-century analytical philosophy." Cohen's book marks the birth of Analytical Marxism (hereafter, AM). According to John E. Roemer (1994, ix):

Cohen's book did something that had not been done before: it defined the theory of historical materialism as a set of claimed theorems following from a set of postulates, and it subjected the validity of the postulates and the inferences drawn from them to the scrutiny which has come to be the hallmark of analytical philosophy.

In the following four decades, AM has produced some of the most influential Marxist analyses in political philosophy (Elster 1985; Cohen 1988, 1995; Roemer 1988; van Parijs, 1993); political science (Przeworski, 1985a; Przeworski and Sprague 1986); economic theory (Roemer 1981, 1982); history (Brenner 1986); and class theory (Wright 1985, 1997). The relevance of AM is readily measured by the vast literature it has generated over the last four decades.

Nevertheless, the overall contribution of AM to critical social theory is controversial. The core tenet of AM is the denial of a specific Marxist methodology, and by adopting the tools of mainstream social science and analytical philosophy, it has indeed translated some Marxist ideas "into terms that bear scrutiny according to the most demanding disciplinary standards in [mainstream] philosophy or in appropriate social science" (Levine 2003, 132). AM analyses, however, have led to the rejection, or radical revision, of a number of concepts and propositions, such that the viability of a distinctively Marxist, or indeed analytical Marxist, perspective in social theory is put into question. As eloquently put by Levine, if the aim of AM was to discover the rational kernel of Marxist theory, and then reconstruct Marxism on that basis, it is tempting to conclude that "the operation succeeded (more or less), but the

patient died" (Levine 2003, 132). In order to properly assess the contribution of AM to critical social theory, and understand the potential of AM to promote further research in explanatory social science, it is only appropriate to start off by defining the object of inquiry.

Analytical Marxism

Given the theoretical, methodological, and even political heterogeneity of analytical Marxists, it is difficult to define AM, either theoretically or in terms of its membership. Attempts to identify a set of substantive propositions shared by all analytical Marxists are necessarily vague and ultimately unconvincing. To be sure, no analytical Marxist "accepts the law of the tendency of the rate of profit to fall ... and ... only one, Brenner, ... still holds the labour theory of value expounded in volume I to be true" (Callinicos 1987, 68), but this by no means identifies AM as a distinct approach in Marxist thought.

There are some common traits, however, that define a style of theorizing, if not a school of thought. A core tenet of AM, and its main departure from classical Marxism, is the denial of a specific Marxist methodology, dialectical or otherwise. Analytical Marxists believe that "although the word 'dialectical' has not always been used without clear meaning, it has never been used with clear meaning to denote a method rival to the analytical one" (Cohen 2000, xxiii).

More precisely, Eric Olin Wright (1989, 38–9) proposes the following definition:

Definition 1. Analytical Marxism (AM) is defined by an analysis of Marxist concerns that is focused through

- C1. "A commitment to *conventional scientific norms* in the elaboration of theory and the conduct of research."
- C2. "An emphasis on the importance of *systematic conceptualisation* This involves careful attention to both definitions of concepts and the logical coherence of interconnected concepts."
- C3. "A concern with a relatively *fine-grained specification of the steps in the theoretical arguments linking concepts*."
- C4. "The importance accorded to the *intentional action of individuals*."

Definition 1 forcefully suggests that the boundaries of AM are wider and fuzzier than is commonly assumed. It encompasses all self-defined analytical Marxists, but it is sufficiently general to allow for a wide range of methodological and substantive positions, such that the school of British Marxist historians, and various analytically oriented Marxist philosophers and social scientists may also be included, even if they do not explicitly associate themselves with AM. As Wright (1989, 39) acknowledges, the methodological commitments expressed in C1–C4 are not the monopoly of AM as a self-conscious school of thought.

C1–C4 are by no means trivial, though, and Definition 1 does exclude a number of approaches, such as critical theory, post-modern and post-structuralist Marxism, the “capital logic” school, etc. The emphasis on conventional scientific norms and on micro-analysis, and the rejection of a distinctive Marxist method, have been questioned on philosophical and methodological grounds. According to critics, AM can provide only limited insights because the analytical method is based on a framework of rigid and exclusive dichotomies, and produces “not clarity and rigor, but systematic misunderstanding and misinterpretation” (Sayers 1989, 82). The analytical method inevitably distorts Marxist theory and the negative conclusions often reached by AM prove the inadequacy of mainstream tools to analyse Marxian topics. Against AM, many authors defend a specific Marxist methodology, based on dialectics and/or methodological holism. A thorough analysis of (the many different concepts of) dialectics and methodological holism is beyond the scope of this entry, but some points can be made, which raise doubts on wholesale rejections of AM on *a priori* grounds.

To be sure, some analytical Marxists have interpreted C1 narrowly as a commitment to specific approaches within the analytical tradition. Much of AM is “grounded philosophically in an empiricist, and more specifically positivist, commitment to an instrumentalist theory of meaning” (Weldes 1989, 360). But this is not implied by C1. Contrary to a common misconception, logical positivism is not a defining feature of AM. In AM, the emphasis on positivism is often only a statement “against post-modernists, conventionalists, relativists, anti-objectivists ... [and]

a claim about the importance of observation in the development of science” (Wright 2001, 16). Marxist philosophers working within the analytical tradition argue that the latter is not defined by a set of common doctrines, but by common standards of successful practice, and have proposed interesting post-positivist analytical approaches to Marx where “the style of analytic philosophy is divorced from positivist substance” (Miller 1984, 4). From this perspective, C1 only requires that Marxist propositions be subjected to rigorous empirical and theoretical scrutiny.

Further, there is no proof that *no* part of Marx’s theory can be fruitfully examined using analytical philosophy. As acknowledged by critics, for example, *Karl Marx’s Theory of History* provides a recognizably Marxist, if not orthodox, version of historical materialism, and “whatever one thinks of the interpretation of [historical materialism] offered there, [it] is one of the classics of twentieth-century Marxist philosophy” (Callinicos 2001, 171).

Actually, AM has reconstructed a set of core propositions that aim to provide the foundations of a distinctive Marxist approach in social theory. According to AM, rather than in its methodology, Marxism remains distinctive “in organizing its agenda around a set of fundamental questions or problems which other theoretical traditions either ignore or marginalize, and identifying a distinctive set of interconnected causal processes relevant to those questions” (Wright 2009, 102).

The four pillars of Marxist social theory

Levine (2003) and Burawoy and Wright (2001) argue that the rational kernel of Marxism reconstructed by AM comprises at least four components.

First is the Marxist theory of history, or historical materialism, which detects an endogenous process that supplies history with a determinate trajectory from one mode of production to another. The AM interpretation of historical materialism is articulated into two main theses. The first states that the level of development of productive forces functionally explains the nature of the economic structure. The second states that the nature of the economic structure functionally explains legal, political, and ideological superstructures. In recent contributions, ana-

lytical Marxists interpret historical materialism as “a theory of historical possibilities opened up by the development of ‘productive forces’” (Levine 2003, 164). From this perspective, historical materialism provides an account of socialism as a possible product of the materialist dynamics and contradictions of capitalism, which can “unify what would otherwise be a motley of well-meaning, but mainly reactive, causes into a movement with a serious prospect of changing life for the better” (Levine 2003, 171). Historical materialism is thus considered as the foundational theory of scientific socialism and a fundamental part of Marxist emancipatory social theory.

Second is a Marxist theory of the state, which views states as expressing the rule of the economically dominant class: to each economic structure, there corresponds a different form of state. According to AM, the proletarian state is the only state whose historical aim is to eliminate the need for states, and socialists should aim to establish institutions that are progressively self-effacing, a view that is incompatible with the exclusive emphasis on the state common to all strains of modern political philosophy.

Third is a Marxist theory of classes, according to which the class structure of a society is central in the explanation of individual economic outcomes and life opportunities, class conflicts, and a range of key social phenomena. Distinctive of Marxist class theory is the conception of classes “as being structured by mechanisms of domination and exploitation, in which economic positions accords some people power over the lives and activities of others” (Wright 2009, 102).

Fourth is a set of socialist – albeit not specifically Marxist – normative commitments, which include self-realization, community, autonomy, and equality in a classless society.

The rigorous reconstruction of these propositions is arguably a significant, positive contribution of AM, which may play an important role for a revival of socialist theory. It is not clear, however, as various analytical Marxists claim, that the above propositions provide the core of a fertile research programme in explanatory social theory. Somewhat paradoxically, AM’s own contributions do not unambiguously support such a claim. On the one hand, some AM analyses directly call into question the validity of the above propositions. On the other hand, much of the

AM work in the social sciences suggests that Marxism has exhausted its role in explanatory social theory; thus, implying that in any case the above reconstruction would be at best a brilliant but sterile logical exercise.

In order to disentangle this issue, a crucial distinction must be made between AM and the narrower approach also known as Rational Choice Marxism (henceforth, RCM).

Rational Choice Marxism

Definition 1 cannot really explain the vast controversy around AM. For in order to identify the minimum common denominator of AM, it does not include the most contentious axioms, which are endorsed only by some analytical Marxists – in particular Jon Elster, Adam Przeworski, and John Roemer – and which define RCM as a sub-school of AM.

Definition 2. Rational Choice Marxism (RCM) is defined by an analysis of Marxist concerns that is focused through C2, C3, and:

- C1'. The use of “state of the arts methods of analytical philosophy and ‘positivist’ social science” (Roemer 1986b, 34).
- C4'(i). Methodological Individualism (henceforth, MI): “the doctrine that all social phenomena – their structure and their change – are in principle explicable in ways that only involve individuals – their properties, their goals, their beliefs and their actions” (Elster 1985, 5);
- C4'(ii). Rational choice explanations. This “involves showing that the action was rational and that it was performed because it was rational. That the action was rational means that given the beliefs of the agent, the action was the best way for him to realize his plans or desires. Hence, rationality goes along with some form of maximizing behaviour” (Elster 1985, 9).

C1' and C4' are much stronger than C1 and C4, and Definition 2 incorporates a strongly reductionist stance that is not shared by all analytical Marxists. For example, Cohen’s (1978) interpretation of historical materialism famously relies on *functional* explanations, which hold that the character of the *explanandum* is determined by its beneficial effect on the *explanans* without any reference to individuals. Wright et al. (1992) argue that AM supports an antireductionist view of explanation that emphasizes the importance

of agents' intentional actions, but allows for supra-individual postulates.

Definition 2 has more stringent methodological and substantive implications than Definition 1. Its main *methodological* corollary is that MI is the only legitimate foundation for the social sciences, and the only parts of Marx's theory which "make sense" are those that can be analysed consistently with MI or, more narrowly, with standard "rational choice models: general equilibrium theory, game theory and the arsenal of modelling techniques developed by neoclassical economics" (Roemer 1986a, 192). Elster (1985, 7) argues that Marx was "committed to [MI], at least intermittently", but, largely due to the influence of Hegelian philosophy, he was not consistent. Elster reads various passages (especially in the *Grundrisse*, on the movement of capital and the subordinate explanatory role of competition) as an explicit denial of MI, and concludes that Marx was methodologically incoherent.

RCM typically reaches two kinds of *substantive* conclusions on Marxian propositions and concepts (including some of the core propositions identified by AM): some are considered either wrong or impossible to conceptualize consistently with C4', and thus are discarded. Roemer (1981) and Elster (1985) dispose of the labor theory of value, the theory of the falling rate of profit, and the theories of capitalist crisis. After a long journey through Marx's writings, Elster concludes that "Today Marxian economics is ... intellectually dead" (Elster 1986, 60), alongside scientific socialism, dialectical materialism, and the theory of productive forces and relations of production (Elster 1986, 186–200). Przeworski (1985a) and Elster (1982, 1985) challenge the Marxist theory of the state and the theory of revolution.

Other concepts and propositions can be analysed within a rational choice framework, but need a substantial revision, such that it is unclear whether "the ensuing theory will be in any distinct sense 'Marxist'" (Przeworski 1985b, 400). Elster (1985) and Przeworski (1985a) translate some intuitions on the symbiotic interaction between classes in a game-theoretic framework, but at the cost of a significant shift in both meaning and political implications. Roemer (1982, 1988) provides microfoundations to exploitation and classes thanks to (possibly at the cost of) a reduction of Marx's theory to an

almost exclusive emphasis on asset inequalities (Veneziani 2013).

The distinction between AM and RCM is therefore important not just for exegetical purposes: they reach different conclusions concerning the future of Marxism and the definition of a distinctive approach in social theory. According to both AM and RCM, a core legacy of Marxism is a set of normative commitments, which are hardly different from liberal egalitarianism, and several contributions have recently appeared that investigate normative issues. In particular, the growing literature on equality of opportunity, and on universal basic income and market socialism as institutional schemes to promote freedom and equality of opportunity can be seen as an offshoot of AM and RCM.

For RCM, this is the *only* legacy of Marxism, which has instead exhausted its role in explanatory social theory: its valuable insights have been incorporated into the mainstream, the rest should be discarded. Instead, AM has reconstructed a set of core propositions that can provide the foundations of a fertile, distinctive Marxist research programme in explanatory social science.

ROBERTO VENEZIANI

References

- Brenner, Robert. 1986. "The Social Basis of Economic Development." In *Analytical Marxism*, edited by John E. Roemer, 23–53. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burawoy, Michael, and Erik Olin Wright. 2001. "Sociological Marxism." In *Handbook of Sociological Theory*, edited by Jonathan H. Turner, 459–86. New York: Plenum Publishers.
- Callinicos, Alex. 1987. *Making History*. London: Polity.
- Callinicos, Alex. 2001. "Having Your Cake and Eating It." *Historical Materialism*, 9: 169–95.
- Cohen, Gerald A. 1978. *Karl Marx's Theory of History: A Defence*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Cohen, Gerald A. 1988. *History, Labour and Freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cohen, Gerald A. 1995. *Self-Ownership, Freedom and Equality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, Gerald A. 2000. *Karl Marx's Theory of History: A Defence*, Revised Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Elster, Jon. 1982. "Marxism, Functionalism, and Game Theory." *Theory and Society*, 11: 453–82.
- Elster, Jon. 1985. *Making Sense of Marx*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Elster, Jon. 1986. *An Introduction to Karl Marx*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levine, Andrew. 2003. *A Future for Marxism?* London: Pluto Press.
- Miller, Richard W. 1984. *Analyzing Marx: Morality Power and History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Przeworski, Adam. 1985a. *Capitalism and Social Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Przeworski, Adam. 1985b. "Marxism and Rational Choice." *Politics and Society*, 14, 379–409.
- Przeworski, Adam, and John Sprague 1986. *Paper Stones: A History of Electoral Socialism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Roemer, John E. 1981. *Analytical Foundations of Marxian Economic Theory*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Roemer, John E. 1982. *A General Theory of Exploitation and Class*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Roemer, John E. 1986a. "'Rational Choice' Marxism: Some Issues of Method and Substance." In *Analytical Marxism*, edited by John E. Roemer, 191–201. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roemer, John E. 1986b. "Introduction." In *Analytical Marxism* edited by John E. Roemer, 3–8. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roemer, John E. 1988. *Free to Lose*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Roemer, John E., ed. 1994. *Foundations of Analytical Marxism*. Aldershot: Elgar.
- Sayers, Sean. 1989. "Analytical Marxism and Morality." *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, Suppl. Vol. 15, 81–104.
- Van Parijs, Philippe. 1993. *Marxism Recycled*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Veneziani, Roberto. 2013. "Exploitation, Inequality, and Power." *The Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 25, 526–45.
- Weldes, Jutta. 1989. "Marxism and Methodological Individualism: A Critique." *Theory and Society*, 18, 353–86.
- Wright, Erik Olin. 1985. *Classes*. London: Verso.
- Wright, Erik Olin. 1989. "What is Analytical Marxism?" *Socialist Review* 19, 35–56.
- Wright, Erik Olin. 1997. *Class Counts: Comparative Studies in Class Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wright, Erik Olin. 2001. An Interview with Erik Olin Wright, by Mark Kirby, available at www.ssc.wisc.edu/~wright/selected-published-writings.htm#ARTICLES.
- Wright, Erik Olin. 2009. "Understanding Class." *New Left Review*, 60, 101–16.
- Wright, Erik Olin, Andrew Levine, and Elliot Sober. 1992. *Reconstructing Marxism*. London: Verso.

Further readings

- Mayer, T.F. 1994. *Analytical Marxism*. London: Sage.
- Roberts, Marcus. 1997. *Analytical Marxism: A Critique*. London: Verso.
- Veneziani, Roberto. 2012. "Analytical Marxism." *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 26, 649–73.

8. Black Marxism

... the turning of Africa into a warren for the commercial hunting of black-skins, signalled the rosy dawn of the era of capitalist production.
Karl Marx, *Capital* Vol. I (2015, 533)

Introduction

It has been assumed that Karl Marx's primary, and perhaps sole, focus was on the class struggle. Indeed, this has led some commentators to ask how Marx and Friedrich Engels could have "found a place in history for race, if class and production came first?" (van Ree 2018, 55). It is not that Marx could have been unaware of racial issues. In 1863, Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation, which declared all slaves free – just four years before the publication of the first volume of *Das Kapital* (1867). In correspondence with Lincoln, Marx (2000) congratulates him on a second term, declaring: "If resistance to the Slave Power was the reserved watchword of your first election, the triumphant war cry of your re-election is Death to Slavery."

While this seems to suggest that Marx was at least *aware* of struggles faced by racialized groups, it remains contested whether the racial struggle has a place within Marx's account of class-based injustice. Should we now reinterpret Marxist theory to account for the racial struggle?

This entry will begin by exploring the conceptual space for a "Black Marxism." We use this phrase throughout to refer to the efforts to interpret Marxist theory for the racial struggle. Such efforts are by no means conclusive but will attempt to provide a meaningful contribution to the debate. Furthermore, this entry will focus primarily on "original" Marxist thought in the works of Marx and Engels in addition to Black radical thinkers. Other contemporary Marxist and socialist writers may provide a unique construction of racial struggle and class relations; our efforts here are to reconcile the classical Marxist tradition and Black radical thought.

To this end, the first section outlines the scope of race within Marx's own works. The second section reviews some of the literature of Black radical thinkers, including Cedric J. Robinson, W.E.B. DuBois, C.L.R. James, and Richard Wright. In so doing, we hope to

provide a starting point for further research into the plausibility and applicability of a "Black Marxist" analytical framework.

Race and Marxist thought

Contrary to the supposition that class was the most important analytic tool for Marx, it has been noted that Marx had an awareness of the unique and distinct features of racialized injustice. According to Lee, "Marx took great care to intricately unravel the strands of how racialized slavery contrasted with wage slavery" and that he recognized that "racialization was another form of ... weapons used against the unification of the working class" (Lee 2011). Indeed, we see in Marx's communications that he thought there was a distinct racial aspect to the slavery in North America and the colonies. In a letter to Pavel Annenkov, Marx (1982, 101) writes: "As for slavery, there is no need for me to speak of its bad aspects ... I do not mean indirect slavery, the slavery of proletariat; I mean direct slavery, the slavery of the Blacks ... in the southern regions of North America." More importantly, he recognized that racialized Negro slavery was what the economic progress of the United States was hinged upon. He continues: "Without slavery there would be no cotton, without cotton there would be no modern industry ... to do away with slavery would be to wipe America off the map."

It is also clear that Marx (2006) did not consider peoples of the Black race to be slaves in *essence*, as many of his contemporaries did: "So say the economists. What is a Negro slave? A man of the black race. The one explanation is worthy of the other. A Negro is a Negro. Only under certain conditions does he become a slave."

We see then that Marx recognizes a unique racial component to the North Atlantic slave trade, and that it cannot be subsumed into standard economic movements throughout history. This provides us with a starting point from which we can start to build a Black or racially aware Marxism.

However, one difficulty with highlighting the racialized components of Marx's thoughts is that regardless of his awareness of it, Marx does not ultimately give primacy to race in his conceptual sphere. We might suggest that Marx, in some ways, was a class reductionist. We only need to turn to the first few words

of the Manifesto to see this: “The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles” (Marx et al. 2012). Indeed, it would be contentious to claim that Marx’s central focus was not on class struggle; this would be to deny the propositional characteristics of the proletariat in being a *class* of workers in comparison to the bourgeois class.

Yet, the claim that Marx was not *only* focused on class need not be so incendiary. Lee (2011) takes it to be the case that the “destruction of capitalism was secondary; it was a means for a large-scale human emancipation that could restore labor from its alienated form back into its human essence.” Marx’s early writings, such as “On the Jewish Question,” reveal an important distinction Marx makes between political emancipation and human emancipation. As Wolff notes, “[For Marx,] real freedom is to be found positively in our relations with other people ... Marx argues that not only is political emancipation insufficient to bring about human emancipation, it is in some sense also a barrier” (Wolff and Leopold 2021). It is not clear if the destruction of racialism is an aspect of political or human emancipation, but we might have reason to think that Marx did think that other struggles, such as the race struggle, were important. His letter to Lincoln celebrates the end of racialized slavery, and as Lee (2011) suggests, “Marx’s primary concern was human emancipation, and the extreme degree of alienation of racialized slave labor and its role as the pivot of Western capitalist civilization marked it as the necessary place to start.”

Certainly, the letter to Lincoln contains very interesting thoughts from Marx regarding the slave struggle and its influence on the working men of Europe, the paradigmatic proletariat. Whilst the address is jointly from the International Working Men’s Association, the writing style suggests that Marx authored significant sections of the letter:

The workingmen of Europe feel sure that, as the American War of Independence initiated a new era of ascendancy for the middle class, so the American Antislavery War will do for the working classes. They consider it an earnest of the epoch to come that it fell to the lot of Abraham Lincoln, the single-minded son of the working class, to lead his country through the matchless struggle for the rescue

of an enchained race and the reconstruction of a social world (Marx 2000, emphasis added).

It is suggested here that the anti-slavery war is a source of inspiration for the working classes of Europe. Additionally, Lincoln is referred to as a “son of the working class” who struggles for the emancipation of an “enchained race.” We see strong motivation to think that, if Lincoln’s “war on slavery” was a war on racialism, then certainly the race struggle is akin in some ways to the class struggle, whilst maintaining a unique feature: race. Here we see the theoretical space in Marx’s writings to begin a formulation of “Black Marxism.”

Black Marxism

For the formulation of our thesis, we take as our central text Cedric J. Robinson’s *Black Marxism*. His work focuses primarily on the work on W.E.B. DuBois, C.L.R. James, and Richard Wright, but it should be noted that there is a wider and more recent scholarship of Black radical thought which contributes to this debate. As Robinson notes, “From the vantage point of a Black radical historiography, DuBois was one of the first American theorists to sympathetically confront Marxist thought in critical and independent terms” (2000, 207). As Robinson (2000, 207) notes, “From the vantage point of a Black radical historiography, DuBois was one of the first American theorists to sympathetically confront Marxist thought in critical and independent terms.” We see across DuBois’ (2013, 46) work an analysis of Marxist thought through a racial lens, particularly in *Black Reconstruction*:

“... the black worker was the ultimate exploited; that he formed that mass of labor which had neither wish nor power to escape from the labor status, in order to directly exploit other laborers, or indirectly by alliance, with capital, to share in their exploitation.” “... It was thus the Black worker, as founding stone of a new economic system in the nineteenth century, and for the modern world, who brought civil war in America. He was its underlying cause”.

We see that DuBois refers to the slaves as “workers”; this demonstrates his commitment to viewing the slaves as another form of the proletariat, just as Marx did. Additionally, DuBois demonstrates that just as the prole-

tariat's labour is exploited under capitalist conditions, so too is the Black worker's – to the "ultimate" degree. Finally, DuBois suggests that it was the slaves who "brought civil war in America." Combining this with Marx's letter to Lincoln which describes how the war inspired the working men of Europe, we see a very clear example of how Marx suggested that "the bourgeoisie ... forged the weapons that bring death to itself; it has also called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons – the modern working class – the proletarians" (Marx et al. 2012, 18). The enslavers forged the weapons of their own demise through their participation in the colonial system. Furthermore, DuBois discusses the relationship between capitalism and slavery: "Black labor became the foundation stone not only of the Southern social structure, but of Northern manufacture and commerce, of the English factory system, of European commerce, of buying and selling on a world-wide scale; new cities were built on the results of black labor" (DuBois 2013, 34).

We again see the idea that racialized labour became a central foundation for capitalism; that the basis for capitalism's operation was racialized exploitation. Therefore, Robinson (2000, 200) notes: "The institution of American slave labor could not be effectively conceptualized as a thing in and of itself. Rather it was a particular historical development for world capitalism which expropriated the labour of African workers as primitive accumulation."

DuBois would go on to demonstrate the "revolutionary force of slave and peasant labourers." The example cited to this end is what he termed the "General Strike": "the total impact of ... 200,000 Black workers, most of them slaves, [becoming] part of the Union's military forces. These, and an even larger number of Blacks, had withdrawn their productive labour" (Robinson 2000, 230).

To this degree, DuBois suggested that the Black workers had an ability to organize themselves into a revolutionary force. This departs from traditional Marxism as it suggests that workers need not unite on class lines but can unite instead along racial lines. This departure is a feature of the fact that Marx did not analyse the condition of Negroes in America:

It was a great loss to American Negroes that the great mind of Marx ... could not have been brought to bear at first hand upon the history of the American Negro between 1876 and the World War. Whatever he said and did concerning the uplift of the working class must, therefore, be modified so far as Negroes are concerned by the fact that he had not studied at first hand their peculiar race problem here in America. (Walden 1933, 399 cited in Robinson 2000, 237)

Regardless, Robinson concludes that DuBois realized that the ideology of the Black struggle "had been sufficient to arouse them into mass resistance and had provided them with a vision of a world they preferred. Their collective action had achieved the force of an historical anti-logic to racism, slavery and capitalism" (Robinson 2000, 240).

Resultantly, we see that DuBois' contributions to Black Marxism are largely an application of Marxist theory to the racial struggle. What makes the strand of Marxism distinctively "Black" is that the struggles were based on racial oppressions and exploitation. Otherwise, some of the general principles of Marxist theory apply in a familiar way; primitive accumulation, the organization of the worker into a revolutionary force and the predicted downfall of the bourgeois at the hand of proletarian class which the bourgeois themselves constructed. In this case, we substitute "bourgeois" for slave-owning class, and the "proletarians" for Black workers and slaves.

CL.R. James and Richard Wright

Continuing a tradition seemingly started by DuBois, Robinson identifies C.L.R. James and Richard Wright as ideological successors of the Black Marxists. We begin with a treatment of James. Perhaps his most famous work was *The Black Jacobins*, which was an historical presentation and analysis of the San Domingue slave revolt (which led to the formation of Haiti). James (1989, ix) regards the revolt as "the only successful slave revolt in history." As Robinson (2000, 274) notes, "The theoretical frame for *The Black Jacobins* was, of course, the theories of revolution developed by Marx, [and] Engels." Might it be that the slaves of San Domingue, in achieving their emancipation, took a Marxist form for revolution even before Marx was writing? James (1989, 86) certainly seems

to think so: “The slaves worked on the land, and, like the revolutionary peasants everywhere, they aimed at the extermination of their oppressors. But working and living together in gangs of hundreds ... they were closer to a modern proletariat than any group of works in existence at the time.”

We see echoes of DuBois’ recognition of the enslaved in the South as an organized, revolutionary movement of proletarians. We also see that the emancipation of San Domingue seemingly contained a process of primitive accumulation – the movement from chattel slavery into a capitalist mode of production – especially where the Haitian Constitutions of 1801 and 1805 “protected the right to private property” (Smith 2009). However, we also see departures from traditional Marxism, at least when it comes to style. Robinson (2000, 275) observes that “While the European proletariat had been formed through and by the ideas of bourgeoisie ..., in Haiti ... the Africans had constructed their own revolutionary culture.” For example, James (1989, 18) writes that: “*We swear to destroy the whites and all that they possess; let us die rather than fail to keep this vow.*” The colonists knew this song and tried to stamp it out, and the Voodoo cult with which it was linked. In vain.” “... Voodoo was the medium of the conspiracy. In spite of all prohibitions, the slaves travelled miles to sing and dance ... and now since the revolution, to hear the political news and make their plans” (James 1989, 86).

The slaves of Haiti had constructed their own revolutionary culture based on their shared identity, culture, and heritage, and seemingly the “bourgeois culture and thought and ideology were irrelevant to the development of revolutionary consciousness” (Robinson 2000, 276). Similar to DuBois, we see evidence of Marxist principles, but with factors relevant to a certain kind of racial identification – the sort of features that make this kind of Marxism uniquely “Black”.

We turn finally to Richard Wright, who, unlike DuBois and James, did not belong to the Black *petit bourgeois* as “his roots were in the black peasantry of the American South” (Robinson 2000, 289). We see in Wright a much clearer expression of a unique “blackness” with regards to radical thought:

The epistemological nature of historical materialism ... presum[ed] the primacy of economic forces and structures. As such, [regarding] the historical development ... for the emergence of the proletariat as a negation of capital society, ... Wright appeared ... to have understood this thesis as a fundamental error ... he had begun to argue that it was necessary that Blacks transform the Marxist critique into an expression of their own emergence as a negation of Western capitalism (Robinson 2000, 299).

Wright clearly believed that the present Marxist conception lacked, and that perhaps it was time for Blacks to become “the vanguard of the American working class” (Robinson 2000, 300). Indeed, “Marxism had ultimately failed to come to terms with nationalism ... with racism ... and with the history of blacks” (Robinson 2000, 302). It would seem that Wright no longer thought Marxism as a valid option as a theory or model for social revolution, but at the very least, “the opposition of Marxist theory to capitalist society was useful to Wright, *theoretically*” (Robinson 2000, 304).

Wright represents a slight change in course from DuBois and James. Whilst both the latter were aware of the limitations of Marxist theory, they saw the salience in it as a model for revolution and theory, whereas Wright “struggled towards a synthesis of Marxism and Black nationalist thought to match ... his colleagues ... [such as] C.L.R. James” (Robinson 2000, 305). Regardless, he found Marxism as a *method* of social analysis compelling. What perhaps limited Wright was his more modern focus, given the peculiarities of the Black American struggle in the twentieth century.

Conclusion

We have seen that there exists a theoretical scope for the formulation of “Black Marxism” as an analytic framework. Both in Marx’s own writings and in the works of Black radical thinkers, we observe a recognition of racialism as a unique (and sometimes central) component of the dialectical struggle under the economic forces of society, particularly in capitalism. We propose three core tenets as a starting point for “Black Marxism,” based on the literature reviewed thus far. “Black

Marxism” requires the adoption of core features of Marxist thought, in addition to:

- I. A (fluid) conceptualization of race and racial identity to allow for the formation of a ‘Black’ revolutionary class.
- II. The belief that racism is an inextricable aspect of capitalism, and that this belief accounts for the oppressions faced by Blacks.
- III. A recognition of the limitations of Marxism with regards to the racial struggle, and consequently a (fluid) reinterpretation of Marxism to help better understand racial struggle in light of these limitations.

Further research in this area is highly encouraged. Of particular interest to readers may include the scholarship of contemporary Marxist and socialist scholars who review the contours of Critical Race Theory and Intersectionality against the Marxist tradition.

AZAAN W. AKBAR

References

- Du Bois, W.E.B. 2013. *Black Reconstruction in America, 1860–1880*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.
- Foner, Phillip S. 1974. *The Black Worker: 1619–1973*. New York: International Publishers.
- James, C.L.R. 1989. *The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L'Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution*, 2nd edition. New York: Vintage.
- Lee, Salome. 2011. “Until We Are All Abolitionists: Marx on Slavery, Race, and Class.” *The International Marxist-Humanist*, October 22. <https://imhojournal.org/articles/abolitionists-marx-slavery-race-class-salome-lee/>. Accessed May 28, 2021.
- Marx, Karl. 2000. “Address of the International Working Men’s Association to Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States of America | 28 January 1865.” *Marx & Engels Internet Archive (marxists.org)*, edited by Zodiac and Brian Baggins. www.marxists.org/archive/marx/iwma/documents/1864/lincoln-letter.htm. Accessed May 27, 2021.
- Marx, Karl. 2015. “Capital | A Critique of Political Economy – Volume 1 | Book One: The Process of Production of Capital.” *Marx & Engels Internet Archive (marxists.org)*. Edited by Friedrich Engels, Zodiac, Hinrich Kuhls, Allan Thurrott, Bill McDorman, Bert Schultz, Martha Gimenez, Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling. www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch31.htm. Accessed May 27, 2021.
- Marx, Karl 2006. “Karl Marx | Wage Labour and Capital | The Nature and Growth of Capital.” *Marx & Engels Internet Archive (marxists.org)*, edited by Friedrich Engels, Zodiac, Brian Baggins and Alek Blain. www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1847/wage-labour/ch05.htm. Accessed May 27, 2021.
- Marx, Karl. 1982. “Marx to Pavel Vasilyevich Annenkov.” In *Marx-Engels Collected Works*, Volume 38, 95–106. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Marx, Karl, Friedrich Engels, Steve Lukes, Stephen Eric Bronner, Vladimir Tismaneanu, and Saskia Sassen. 2012. *The Communist Manifesto*, edited by Jeffrey C. Isaac. New Haven; London: Yale University Press.
- Perlo, Victor. 1975. *Economics of Racism*. New York: International Publisher.
- Robinson, Cedric J. 2000. *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Smith, Ashley. 2009. “The Black Jacobins: A Review of C. L. R. James’s Classic Account of Haiti’s Slave Revolt.” *International Socialist Review* (January). <https://isreview.org/issue/63/black-jacobins>. Accessed May 27, 2021.
- van Ree, Erik. 2018. “Marx and Engels’s Theory of History: Making Sense of the Race Factor.” *Journal of Political Ideologies* (December): 54–73.
- Walden, Daniel. 1933. “Karl Marx and the Negro.” *The Crisis* (March): 399.
- Willhelm, Sidney M. 1980. “Can Marxism Explain America’s Racism?” *Social Problems* 28, no. 2: 98–112.
- Wolff, Jonathan, and David Leopold. 2021. “Karl Marx.” *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2021 Edition). <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2021/entries/marx/>. Accessed May 27, 2021.

Further selected readings

- Crenshaw, Kimberle W. 2023. *On Intersectionality: Essential Writings*. New York: The New Press.
- Mills, Charles W. 2000. *From Class to Race: Essays in White Marxism and Black Radicalism*. Washington D.C.: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Cohen, G.A. 2000. *Karl Marx’s Theory of History: A Defence*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

See also

- Intersectionality; W.E.B. Du Bois; Marcus Garvey; Cedric L. Robinson; Huey P. Newton

9. Historical Marxism

From the mid-twentieth-century, radical historiography's most celebrated modern collectivity – the Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB) Historians Group – developed a cohort of economic, social, and political historians widely designated as “the British Marxist historians.” Conventional wisdom regards this contingent as like-minded, although more recent discussions have gestured toward differentiation (Kaye 1984; Matthews 2013). Schooled in a Marxist approach to the past by CPGB stalwarts, Maurice Dobb and Dona Torr, those tutored in historical materialism in the 1940s and 1950s included Christopher Hill, Eric J. Hobsbawm, George Rudé, Edward Palmer (E.P.) Thompson, Dorothy Thompson, John Saville, Rodney Hilton, Victor Kiernan, and a precocious Raphael Samuel, later a founder of the History Workshop movement.

All of these historians confronted the Cold War climate of 1950s anti-communism. This relegated many intellectuals to the margins of academic life, as evident in an early study by the critical political scientist Neal Wood (1959). The British Marxist historians thus shared much, and their research was, in general, committed to exploring the dynamic of how men and women made their histories constrained by the material circumstances of their times. As a group, these writers produced a library of books and articles, many of them landmarks of creative interpretation that have secured them places of unrivalled influence across the boundaries of academic disciplines in the humanities and social sciences. Few books are more widely cited and influential than E.P. Thompson's *The Making of the English Working Class* (1963). Rare is the historian as widely read and internationally acclaimed as Eric J. Hobsbawm (Evans 2019).

The impressive body of research and writing associated with the British Marxist historians has been of inestimable worth in the forging of a critical political science. It has historicized how capitalism developed and, at the same time, it situates processes such as class formation and class struggle at the interface of their origins in determined socio-economic relations and their outcomes in complex negotiations of ideological, cultural, political, and organizational forms of

resistance. If the touchstone of the British Marxist historians' collective endeavor was the insistence that social inequality was a foundation of capitalism, the individual historians working in this way nonetheless defy simplistic attempts to reduce their collective contribution to a common template. Research methods, analytic orientations, and stylistic sensibilities varied greatly within the group. The Marxisms of these distinguished practitioners of historical materialism parted ways over time, not only intellectually, but politically. Most left the CPGB in 1956, disillusioned with Stalinism and the revelations of its wrong-doing, very much on display with Moscow's suppression of the Hungarian Revolution. But some, like Hobsbawm, stayed in the Party, while others who left, such as Christopher Hill, long held to the notion that those leading the rebellious exodus – the Thompsons and John Saville – should have stayed in the CPGB and fought to win over the membership to their views.

Dobb laid the structural foundations on which the British Marxist historians layered their future interpretive insights. His *Studies in the Development of Capitalism* (1947) presented an overview of Marx's appreciation of how a social order of acquisitive individualism, privatized property, and wage labor emerged from the dissolution of feudalism. This background was never far from the more particular research of the British Marxist historians, although, as Christopher Hill's extraordinary body of writing on seventeenth-century England revealed, there were rich reservoirs of human experience to explore beyond the narrowly economic subordination of the plebeian masses.

Where Dobb placed an accent on the ways in which laboring men and women were forced from the relative autonomies of handicraft production and subsistence agricultural pursuits, for instance, Hill dug deeply into how this protracted process was lived in its seventeenth-century beginnings. Hill's cumulative writings reimagined the political, intellectual, and cultural history of seventeenth-century England, and the revolutions that punctuated that century (Hill 1961). Drawn to the armed conflict and political turmoil of the 1640–88 years, Hill (1996) was captivated by popular struggles for liberty. He relished the historical moment when his fellow citizens repudiated monarchy, beheading a King, Charles I being

executed January 30, 1649. Among the varied subjects Hill explored creatively were the place of the Church and various dissident sects in the politics of upheaval, images of the Antichrist, the radicalism of John Milton's poetry, the meaning of Oliver Cromwell, and the socioeconomic shifts in Reformation life that presaged the Industrial Revolution (Hill 1967, 1970, 1984, 1990, 1996). His mastery of the pamphlet literature generated during years of seventeenth-century Civil War was unrivalled among historians of the period, and Hill put this expertise to good use in his sympathetic and creative appreciation of the precursors of Marxist revolt, the Levellers, Diggers, and Ranters. These oppositional currents figured forcefully in one of Hill's most powerful books, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution* (1972). Even mainstream historians who were hostile to Marxism, such as Lawrence Stone (1965), came to concede that Hill was one of the few historians who could be said to have dominated a field of study, the second and third quarters of seventeenth-century England being referred to as "Hill's half-century."

Hill's studies were situated on the cusp of the transition from feudalism to capitalism. The British Marxist historians played a significant role in what came to be known as the transition debate, a scholarly inquiry into capitalism's origins in the contradictory trajectory of feudal social and economic relations (Hilton 1972). This debate first kicked off in the early 1950s in journals that were either Marxist or sympathetic to Marxism, such as *Science & Society* and *Past & Present*, and involved Dobb, Hill, Hobsbawm, Victor Kiernan, and Rodney Hilton. They provided a foundation on which future contributions by so-called political Marxists such as Robert Brenner and Ellen Meiksins Wood would build (Aston and Philpin 1987; Wood 1991; Wood 2002).

Hilton's (1976, 1985) close studies of class conflict and the crisis of feudalism indicated how one British Marxist historian could focus inquiry on struggle and resistance, digging deeply into the available and opaque archives of medieval manors to excavate a subterranean history of the tension-ridden relations of lord and peasant that culminated in an uprising of the landed poor in 1381. Hobsbawm's contribution to the transition debate, a lengthy two-part essay on the crisis of the seventeenth

century, was of an entirely different kind. Analytically sweeping, and drawing on published sources in English, French, Portuguese, Spanish, and German, Hobsbawm ranged widely over the European feudal economy. He outlined how an entrenched seigneurialism collapsed in upon itself, succumbing to its internal contradictions. Progressive new economies emerged, strengthening absolutism and its continental metropolitan centers, expanding home markets, especially in socially transformed England, spawning a new colonialism. Out of such processes grew the plantation productions of the New World and the slave trade that provided them a labor force and prodded into being sectoral pillars of the Industrial Revolution like the cotton manufactory (Hobsbawm in Aston 1967, 5–62).

Hobsbawm was arguably the most wide-ranging and the most explicitly and unambiguously Marxist of the British Marxist historians (Evans 2019; Palmer 2020). If he helped anchor the transition debate in the seventeenth century, his *oeuvre* concentrated on the long nineteenth century (1789–1914) and the short twentieth (1914–91), which he traversed in a synthetic *tour de force* of modern history, his popularly-pitched *Age* tetralogy: *The Age of Revolution, 1789–1848* (1962); *The Age of Capital, 1848–1875* (1975); *The Age of Empire, 1875–1914* (1987); and *The Age of Extremes, 1914–1991* (1994). This impressive cascade of texts was preceded and punctuated by pioneering statements on labor history, primitive rebels, and social banditry, all of which helped to establish Hobsbawm as the most widely read of the British Marxist historians in the global south (Hobsbawm 1959, 1964, 1969, 1984). An entire field of modern peasant studies, in which critical political scientists and anthropologists as divergent in their views as James C. Scott (1976) and Gavin Smith (1989) have made significant contributions, is unimaginable without reference to Hobsbawm.

An historian whose analytic sensibilities were always attuned to power and the structural determinations that constrained the agency of the dispossessed, Hobsbawm nevertheless collaborated with a pioneering advocate of "history from below," George Rudé. Rudé's studies of eighteenth-century crowds in the French Revolution and the Wilkes and Liberty mobilizations in England reconfigured understandings of popular mass

activity as a significant political force (Rudé 1959; Rudé 1962; Krantz 1985). Hobsbawm and Rudé teamed up to explore the agricultural laborers' revolt of 1830, when an anonymous "Captain Swing" threatened landlords who introduced threshing machines that displaced rural workers, decimating household economies in the countryside and precipitating a series of riotous social convulsions (Hobsbawm and Rudé 1968).

This was an integral part of the process of class formation that the British Marxist historians in general had long been concerned with exploring in their works. The most imaginative and influential statement in this subject was E.P. Thompson's *The Making of the English Working Class*. This book, which had been preceded by Thompson's large study of the socialism of William Morris and the 1956 crisis of Stalinism that fractured the CPGB was *sui generis* in the clarity of what it was *against* (Thompson 1955; Winslow 2014; Flewers and McIlroy 2016). Irreverent in tone, pointedly polemical in the structure of its argument, and vehement in upholding the case for the human costs exacted over the course of the Industrial Revolution, Thompson's text took the objections of the British Marxist historians to mainstream conservative interpretations and stamped them with a unique voice.

As an engaged attempt to write workers and their consciousness of themselves, their aspirations, and their needs back into the history of the Industrial Revolution, Thompson also ran headlong into a number of interpretive limitations of left-wing thought. He was especially concerned with the constraints on analysis imposed by an economic/determinist strain of thought within Marxism. This reduced class formation to a static equation in which impersonal forces separating subsistence agrarian producers from the land and artisans from their handicrafts combined with the rise of steam-powered factories to create a proletariat seemingly devoid of agency and active claims on ideas, institutions, and intentions. Such a view of class formation was remarkably sterile. It was complemented, in some ways, by mainstream economic historians, who argued in the 1950s that historical progress was marked by rising living standards measured out in calculations of "mythical averages" of diet, wage rates, and housing stock. In this measurement of class formation, capitalism's coming in England's

Industrial Revolution was a story of human betterment, one that cleansed history of grievance and discontent, yet again flattening experience (Hayek 1954).

This was a position Thompson could not countenance, but when he turned to the interpretive icons of traditional labor history, such as the Fabian and constitutionally inclined chroniclers of the forward march of the trade unions, J.L. and Barbara Hammond and Sidney and Beatrice Webb, a different kind of blind spot was evident. For these commentators, who contributed much of importance, could only see the respectable face of working-class organization, its successes registered in petitions to parliament and a legal tradition of building stable organizations.

A more complex history emerged out of Thompson's research into the politics and cultures of working people in the 1790–1832 years. The originality of *The Making of the English Working Class* lay in Thompson's refusal of the blinders that all conventional interpretation – of the right or the left – imposed on research and analysis. His history offered instead a rich tapestry of crowds and challenging ideas; midnight marches and purposeful machine breaking; radical artisans and unruly inhabitants of the emerging congested cities, or "Satan's strongholds"; contests between the democratic and authoritarian impulses of varied religious communities; the erosion of democratic rights and material well-being; the importance of agitators and advocates of popular rights, such as Thomas Paine, William Cobbett, or Henry Hunt, as well as the booksellers and small shopkeepers who hawked their penny pamphlets and scandalous political tracts; and the atrocities of child labor. If Thompson considered the formation of trade unions and conventional campaigns to preserve democratic entitlements as pivotal to the making of the working class, he was also insistent that underground activities, clandestine conspiracies, the armed resistance that was all too often futile, and a host of lost causes, were also important. As stated in his famous Preface:

I am seeking to rescue the poor stockinger, the Luddite cropper, the "obsolete" hand-loom weaver, the "utopian" artisan, and even the deluded follower of Joanna Southcott, from the enormous condescension of posterity. Their crafts and traditions may have been dying.

Their hostility to the new industrialism may have been backward-looking. Their communitarian ideals may have been fantasies. Their insurrectionary conspiracies may have been foolhardy. But they lived through these times of acute social disturbance, and we did not. Their aspirations were valid in terms of their own experience; and, if they were casualties of history, they remain, condemned in their own lives, as casualties. (Thompson 1968, 13)

This was a voice never before heard in the writing of the history of the working class.

Subsequent scholarship has often addressed lacunae in Thompson's understanding of class formation, especially with respect to gender and how the English working class was made in conjunction with imperialism's transnational parallel history of colonialism (Scott 1988, 68–92; Clark 1997; Linebaugh 2019; Gopal 2019; Satia 2020). Hobsbawm, too, has been the subject of feminist critique for his treatment of women (Hobsbawm 1978; Alexander, Davin, and Hostettler 1979). These were no doubt areas of inquiry that received less attention than they might have among the British Marxist historians, although CPGB Historians Group members Dorothy Thompson and Victor Kiernan did write extensively in later studies on women and Chartism and on British imperialism (Thompson 1976; Thompson 1984; Thompson 1990; Kiernan 1969; Kiernan 1974). E.P. Thompson's subsequent research and writing on plebeian culture and resistance in eighteenth-century England confronted gender relations more explicitly than he had done in his 1963 book, which predated the explosion of women's history and gendered analysis figuring decisively in the proliferation of social and cultural histories in the 1980s and 1990s (Thompson 1991).

The British Marxist historians have had a prodigious impact among historians, where the historiography of capitalism and class formation looks decidedly different because of the research and writing of this prolific group. But the impact of this cohort of intellectuals also reaches across scholarly disciplinary boundaries, registering in diverse ways. A number of these British Marxists came to the study of history through an appreciation of literature, and Thompson, for instance, was both a poet and a novelist, as well as a popular political essayist, as was Hobsbawm, a jazz aficionado who, under the

pseudonym Francis Newton, wrote insightfully on this musical genre, its practitioners, and its "scene" (Hobsbawm 1959; Thompson 1980; Thompson 1988; Inglis 1999; Kiernan 1989). Writing on the working class outside of the confines of labor history as an academic specialty bears the undeniable imprint of the British Marxist historians. This is especially evident in works of critical political science and sociology associated with scholars and public intellectuals as varied as Ira Katznelson, Ellen Meiksins Wood, Stanley Aronowitz, Harry Braverman, Staughton Lynd, and Frances Fox Piven-Richard A. Cloward (Katznelson and Zolberg 1986; Wood 1986; Aronowitz 1973; Braverman 1974; Lynd 2014; Fox Piven and Cloward 1971; Piven and Cloward 1978). Critical political science writing addressing subordination and resistance owes much to the writings and perspectives of Hill, Hobsbawm, and Thompson (Scott 1985; Scott 1990). The generation of British Marxist historians that produced the impressive body of research and writing outlined here is now gone, most having died between 1990–2012. Their critical sensibilities, empirical findings, and challenging provocations live on, however, constituting a rich legacy to be used in the struggle to both interpret the world and change it.

BRYAN D. PALMER

References

- Alexander, Sally, Anna Davin, and Eve Hostettler. 1979. "Labouring Women: A Reply to Eric Hobsbawm," *History Workshop Journal* 8 (Autumn): 174–82.
- Aronowitz, Stanley. 1973. *False Promises: The Shaping of American Working Class Consciousness*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Aston, T.H. and C.H.E. Philipin, eds., 1987. *The Brenner Debate: Agrarian Class Structure and Economic Development in Pre-Industrial Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Braverman, Harry. 1974. *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Clark, Anna. 1997. *The Struggle for the Breeches: Gender and the Making of the British Working Class*. Oakland: University of California Press.
- Evans, Richard J. 2019. *Eric Hobsbawm: A Life in History*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Flewers, Paul and John McIlroy, eds., 2016. 1956: *John Saville, EP Thompson & The Reasoner*. London: Merlin.

- Fox Piven, Frances and Richard A. Cloward. 1971. *Regulating the Poor: The Function of Public Welfare*. New York: Vintage.
- Fox Piven, Frances and Richard A. Cloward. 1978. *Poor People's Movements: Why They Succeed, How They Fail*. New York: Vintage.
- Gopal, Priyamvada. 2019. *Insurgent Empire: Anticolonial Resistance and British Dissent*. London: Verso.
- Hayek, Frederick A., ed. 1954. *Capitalism and the Historians*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Hill, Christopher. 1961. *The Century of Revolution, 1603–1714*. London: Nelson.
- Hill, Christopher. 1967. *Reformation to Industrial Revolution*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Hill, Christopher. 1970. *God's Englishman: Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution*. New York: Dial.
- Hill, Christopher. 1972. *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution*. New York: Viking.
- Hill, Christopher. 1984. *The Experience of Defeat: Milton and Some Contemporaries*. New York: Viking.
- Hill, Christopher. 1990. *Antichrist in Seventeenth-Century England*. London: Verso.
- Hill, Christopher. 1996. *Liberty Against the Law: Some Seventeenth-Century Controversies*. London: Allen Lane/Penguin Press.
- Hilton, Rodney, ed. and introduced, 1976. *The Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism*. London: New Left Books.
- Hilton, Rodney. 1985. *Class Conflict and the Crisis of Feudalism*. London: Hambledon Press.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. 1959. *Primitive Rebels: Studies in Archaic Forms of Social Movements in the 19th and 20th Centuries*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. [Francis Newton]. 1959. *The Jazz Scene*. London: MacGibbon and Kee.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. 1962. *The Age of Revolution, 1789–1848*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. 1964. *Labouring Men: Studies in the History of Labour*. New York: Basic.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. 1967 [originally 1954]. "The Crisis of the Seventeenth Century." In *Crisis in Europe, 1560–1660*, edited by Trevor Aston. New York: Anchor Books.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. 1969. *Bandits*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. 1975. *The Age of Capital, 1848–1875*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. 1978. "Man and Woman in Socialist Iconography." *History Workshop Journal* 6 (Autumn): 121–38.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. 1987. *The Age of Empire, 1875–1914*. London: Guild Publishing.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. 1994. *The Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century, 1914–1991*. London: Michael Joseph.
- Fred Inglis, ed. 1999. *E.P. Thompson: Collected Poems*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Bloodaxe.
- Katznelson, Ira and Aristide R. Zolberg, ed., 1986. *Working-Class Formation: Nineteenth-Century Patterns in Western Europe and the United States*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kaye, Harvey J. 1984. *The British Marxist Historians*. London: Polity.
- Kiernan, Victor G. 1969. *The Lords of Human Kind: European Attitudes Towards the Outside World in the Imperial Age*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Kiernan, Victor G. 1974. *Marxism and Imperialism: Studies*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Kiernan, Victor G. 1989. *Poets, Politics, and the People*. London: Verso.
- Krantz, Frederick, ed., 1985. *History From Below: Studies in Popular Protest and Popular Ideology in Honour of George Rudé*. Montreal: Concordia University.
- Linebaugh, Peter. 2019. *Red Round Globe Hot Burning: A Tale at the Crossroads of Commons & Closure, of Love & Terror, and of Kate & Ned Despard*. Oakland: University of California Press.
- Lynd, Staughton. 2014. *Doing History from the Bottom Up: On E.P. Thompson, Howard Zinn, and Rebuilding the Labor Movement from Below*. Chicago: Haymarket.
- Matthews, Wade. 2013. *The New Left, National Identity, and the Break-up of Britain*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Palmer, Bryan D. 1994. *E.P. Thompson: Objections and Oppositions*. London: Verso.
- Palmer, Bryan D. 2020. "Hobsbawm's Century." *Catalyst: A Journal of Theory & Strategy* 4 (Spring), 61–100.
- Rudé, George. 1959. *The Crowd in the French Revolution*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Rudé, George. 1962. *Wilkes and Liberty: A Social Study of 1763 to 1774*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Satia, Priya. 2020. *Times Monster: How History Makes History*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Scott, James C. 1976. *The Moral Economy of the Peasant: Rebellion and Subsistence in Southeast Asia*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Scott, James C. 1985. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Scott, James C. 1990. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Scott, Joan. 1988. *Gender and the Politics of History*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Smith, Gavin. 1989. *Livelihood and Resistance: Peasants and the Politics of Land in Peru*. Oakland: University of California Press.
- Stone, Lawrence. 1965. "England's Revolution." *New York Review of Books* V (26 August).
- Thompson, Dorothy. 1976. "Women and Nineteenth-Century Radical Politics: A Lost

- Dimension.” In *The Rights and Wrongs of Women*, edited by Juliet Mitchell and Ann Oakley, 112–38. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Thompson, Dorothy. 1984. *The Chartists: Popular Politics in the Industrial Revolution*. New York: Pantheon.
- Thompson, Dorothy. 1990. *Queen Victoria: Gender & Power*. London: Virago.
- Thompson, E.P. 1955. *William Morris: Romantic to Revolutionary*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Thompson, E.P. 1968. *The Making of the English Working Class*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Thompson, E.P. 1980. *Writing by Candlelight*. London: Merlin.
- Thompson, E.P. 1988. *The Sykaos Papers*. New York: Pantheon.
- Thompson, E.P. 1991. *Customs in Common*. London: Penguin Books.
- Winslow, Cal, ed., 2014. *E.P. Thompson and the Making of the New Left*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Wood, Ellen Meiksins. 1986. *The Retreat from Class: A New ‘True’ Socialism*. London: Verso.
- Wood, Ellen Meiksins. 1991. *The Pristine Culture of Capitalism: An Historical Essay on Old Regimes and Modern States*. London: Verso.
- Wood, Ellen Meiksins. 2002. *The Origins of Capitalism: A Longer View*. London: Verso.
- Wood, Neal. 1959. *Communism and the British Intellectuals*. London: Victor Gollancz.

10. Institutional Marxism

Institutional Marxism begins from a dual critique of both Marxism and institutionalism (Maher and Aquanno 2018; Maher 2016). While Marxist political economy has tended to forsake institutional analysis in its search for economic laws, institutionalists have been unable to define capitalism as a historically specific set of social relations – and therefore to understand what is distinctively *capitalist* about the institutional forms they analyse. Institutional Marxism (IM) transcends these limits by identifying the causal role of institutions in determining historical processes, while also illustrating how institutional formations are conditioned, though not fully determined, by the basic dynamics of capitalism. Institutional Marxism argues that historical eventuation is neither accidental nor inevitable. Rather, history evolves in relation to the open-ended operation of distinctly capitalist pressures exerted upon conscious, socially embedded human beings organized into specific institutional formations.

The foundations of IM lie in three key concepts: that of *emergence* from the philosophy of Critical Realism, *relative autonomy* from neo-Marxist state theory, and the *mode of production* from Marxist political economy. Drawing on these concepts, IM brings an enriched ontology to institutional analysis, and builds out the institutional differentiation of political and economic power. At the same time, however, IM addresses important weaknesses in each of these literatures. While Marxist political economy has all too often tended toward functionalist and economic theorizations, the concept of emergence makes possible an understanding of human societies as open systems. Similarly, IM augments Critical Realism's abstract conception of stratified ontology with the analysis of the core dynamics of the capitalist system elaborated within Marxist political economy.

Drawing on institutionalist social science helps to enrich the concept of relative autonomy developed within Marxist state theory by pointing toward the need for a theorization of corporate power that does much to clarify the concepts of state power and class power. Crucially, this also allows for a sharp periodization of capitalist development. Distinct

“phases” of capitalist development are discernable as specific configurations of state and corporate institutional power. Indeed, one of the key strengths of IM is its ability to capture both the *generality* of capitalism as well as the *specificity* of the particular contexts within which it has developed historically. In this way, IM provides the grounding for a robust comparative method for conducting rich empirical analyses of the specific institutional forms that have characterized capitalist societies in different places and times.

The “mode of production”: capital as a totalizing logic

The starting point for any understanding of capitalist society today undoubtedly remains Marx's theorization of the capitalist *mode of production*. The core elements of this concept are that capitalism is a system characterized by class struggle, and disciplined by the coercive laws of competition. These generative mechanisms of class and competition further give rise to tendencies toward concentration and centralization, technological innovation, and periodic crises. However, none of these dynamics can be expressed in terms of the linear and mechanistic development of fixed laws. In order to avoid teleological conceptions of history as an inevitable march toward some fixed endpoint, we eschew models of capitalism as a static and functionally integrated “closed system.” Rather, human societies must be understood as *open systems*, and capital not as a fixed totality, but rather a *totalizing logic*. Tracing the operation of capitalism's basic generative mechanisms in specific historical contexts therefore requires empirical investigation.

IM draws on the concept of *emergence* developed within the philosophy of Critical Realism to situate the dynamics of the capitalist mode of production, and the institutional forms in which they are realized, within a hierarchical casual structure (Bhaskar 1978; Collier 1994; Creavan 2000). Critical Realism understands reality as stratified, and characterized by hierarchically ordered generative mechanisms. It upholds the “directional logic” of more basic mechanisms, while also preserving the “totally novel” power within each layer (Creaven 2000, 32, 41, 59). Higher order strata are not simply the result of the mechanistic working

out of mechanisms located within lower order strata. Rather, these are new phenomena that emerge from the “specific interaction or combination of generative mechanisms internal to those objects or structures which exist ... immediately basic” to higher strata (Collier 1994, 110; Creaven 2000, 31). The rootedness of higher order processes in lower-level mechanisms does not imply a one-way relation between strata: there can be no true causal stratification, of course, if lower mechanisms simply determine higher ones (Archer 1995, 14).

This notion of emergence therefore allows us to think of human societies as *open systems*. Functionalist models of capitalism as determined by inexorable “iron laws” cannot explain such complex open systems, which are characterized by immense variation and contingency in the realization of causal mechanisms. Conceiving of society as an open system allows IM to attribute a distinct causal role to institutions, while also situating them as the historical forms in which capitalism’s basic structural pressures are realized and practically reproduced. The action of causal mechanisms in open systems cannot be expected to have uniform effects across different spatio-temporal contexts, since interactions at less basic levels of the causal hierarchy are increasingly variegated.

Institutions are the particular historical organizational and discursive forms in which capitalist structural dynamics are embodied and realized. At the same time, these forms are the products of concrete, conscious human beings – though they nevertheless pre-exist, condition, and shape these human beings. Institutions constrain and discipline human behavior, but they also *enable* these projects by assembling the power resources necessary to carry them out on larger scales. In doing so, they create and reproduce positions of command and subordination, and therefore generate particular internal contradictions and forms of resistance, as well as conflict and coalescence with other social forces and institutional forms. Institutions develop in relation to the projects of the conscious human subjects that comprise them, as well as in relation to more basic capitalist structural pressures. They are therefore neither separate from, nor reducible to, higher or lower order causal strata.

Rather than seeing structure and agency as opposing poles, the theory of emergence leads

IM to advance a more dialectical view of the role of human activity in shaping history, rooted in the interconnectivity between subjectivity and objective conditions. In this view, human subjectivity is a moment in the unfolding of objective history: “agency” arises in the historical effects of the projects undertaken by these subjects. As Jean Paul Sartre (1968, 33) asserted, “subjectivity is neither everything nor nothing; it represents a moment in the objective process ... and this moment is perpetually eliminated only to be perpetually reborn.” This underlines what we take to be the fundamental axiom of historical materialism: humans “make their own history, but they do not make it just as they please” (Marx 1852, 103).

This means that the historical “totality” is never complete; it is always in a state of *becoming*, of *being made* in the concrete life activity of really existing human beings. The insistence that human societies are open systems is rooted in this understanding that human beings – as conscious, creative subjects – lie uniquely outside of mechanical explanation. This is not to deny that human beings are conditioned, but rather to insist that they cannot merely be *reduced* to these conditions: as conscious beings, they exist in a *relation* to their situation, and thus are never fully determined by it. The *meaning* of a situation, and how it is to be *lived*, is up to discursively constituted human subjects. It is this *subjective* moment in the unfolding of concrete history that is, at bottom, responsible for the dynamism of capital, and the contingency of the institutional forms it takes.

This conception of society as an open system characterized by stratified generative mechanisms means capital is not a closed *totality* that mechanically unfolds according to an “inner necessity,” but rather a *totalizing logic* manifest in the form of experiential pressures upon many-sided, institutionally embedded human subjects. E.P. Thompson similarly saw history in terms of a dialogue between “social being” and “social consciousness,” with the latter grounded in the former. Nevertheless, Thompson (1978, 9) held, “social consciousness is not merely the passive recipient of reflections ... as being is thought so thought is also lived – people may, within limits, live the social or sexual expectations which are imposed upon them by dominant conceptual categories.” As such, we must understand:

history as *process*, as open-ended and indeterminate eventuation – but not for that reason devoid of rational logic or of determining *pressures* – in which categories are defined in particular contexts but are continuously undergoing historical redefinition, and whose structure is not pre-given but protean, continually changing in form and in articulation. (Thompson 1978, 84)

Institutions are crucial not only in constituting “social being,” but also in shaping “social consciousness.” They establish phenomenological frameworks for the realization of capitalism’s structural pressures, as well as for practices of resistance and the elaboration of alternative realities. The complexity and contingency of the relationship between “social being” and “social consciousness” derives from the possibly infinite variability of these frames of reference – “worlds” or “realities” – which form the basis for interpretation and action. Social conflict, therefore, occurs not merely over quantities of economic values or political power, but also over clashing *normative* values: as Thompson wrote, “values no less than material needs will always be a locus of *contradiction*, of struggle between alternative values and views-of-life” (Thompson 1978, 175). Moreover, institutional embeddedness does not simply represent a *constraint* to the functioning of an exogenous “logic” of capital, but rather *establishes the very positive conditions that make possible the realization of foundational mechanisms*.

In these ways, IM seeks to enrich institutional analysis with a “structuralist” model of the “logic of capital,” which becomes a heuristic for interpreting history by proposing a series of hypotheses. IM is thus empirical, but not empiricist. It approaches the empirical not with an analytic *tabula rasa* upon which to inscribe sets of isolated dependent and independent variables, but rather begins from a heuristic model of capital derived from the broader body of theoretical knowledge developed within the Marxist tradition, and seeks to identify the generative mechanisms governing institutional evolution. IM is thereby able to comprehend both the distinct historical *specificity* and *generality* of capitalism: our understanding of capitalism in *general* is enhanced through comparative study of the different *particular* contexts in which it has developed, which leads us to identify the

operation of the causal structures that have produced such varied empirical effects.

Marxist state theory: grasping political and economic power

The Marxist theory of the state is the best starting point for analysing the contradictory nexus of economic and political power in capitalist society. The central theoretical concept of this literature is the “relative autonomy” of the state from the power of the capitalist class (Miliband 1969; 1977; 1983; Poulantzas 1978a; 1978b; 1975). According to this view, the state is not merely the direct instrument of the capitalist class. Rather, it operates at a distance from the immediate short-term interests of particular capitalists in order to act in the general, long-term interests of the system as a whole. This differs both from the older, orthodox Marxist notion of the state as merely the executive committee of the bourgeoisie (Lenin 1933 [1917], 2021 [1917]; Marx 1871) as well as from subsequent institutionalist accounts which sought to depict the state as *fully* autonomous from the broader social structures in which it is embedded (Evans et al. 1985). The latter developed in the wake of Ralph Miliband’s successful Marxist critique of the then-hegemonic “pluralist” paradigm, as Theda Skocpol and others sought to “bring the state back in” – but without its class foundations (Panitch 1999; Barrow 2016; Cammack 1989).

As a result, and despite their differences, subsequent “new institutionalists” have seen institutions as the ontological foundation of social reality, playing the central role in determining human behaviour and thus shaping history. IM is sympathetic to the desire to give institutions full ontological status as “path dependent and path shaping complexes of social action” (Jessop 2001, 1217). Indeed, historical institutionalists have done well to show that institutional rules, norms, and codes of conduct “stabilize the cognitive and normative expectations of ... actors by shaping and promoting a common worldview” (Jessop 2001, 1231). Yet theories of path dependence are inadequate to an emergentist theory of institutions. In simply assuming the stability of institutional ensembles, such theories neither define a clear causal role for human agency, nor refer to the underlying generative mechanisms that con-

dition institutional reproduction and shape every “present.” Such theorizations imply that institutions endogenously propel themselves forward, in isolation from the broader structures they mediate. Thus, defining institutions in abstraction from the basic dynamics of capitalism, the new institutionalists have been unable to explain what is distinctively *capitalist* about institutional development.

Yet there can be no doubt that some of the institutionalist’s criticisms of Marxism strike closer to the mark – particularly its tendency to think of the state (and institutions in general) as epiphenomenal of abstract “iron laws,” and to present overly general theorizations of the capitalist state. Resolving these theoretical problems requires one to situate institutions as emergent properties of capitalist society. Furthermore, IM emphasizes that lacking a robust theory of institutions Marxist state theorists have relied upon an impoverished notion of “relative autonomy” whereby “state power” is seen as relatively autonomous from “class power.” While the state is an institutional form, “class power” is not considered to be one. Indeed, much Marxist analysis remains focused on the functional-relational level of power, defining “capital” and “labor” in abstraction from particular institutional ensembles. The concept of “class power” thus needs to be broken down to reveal its institutional components.

This means that relative autonomy must be defined in relation to the historical interaction between specific institutional ensembles. At this level of *institutional* power, the proper relation is not between “class power” and “state power,” but rather between “state power” and “corporate power,” and on the other hand, the institutional forms of working-class organization which both articulate working-class power and discipline the working class. From this point of view, one could say that the function of *state power* is to organize *corporate power* into *class power* on the basis of a given balance of class forces, by undertaking a broad set of political practices not reducible to negotiated compromises among class economic imperatives. Moreover, institutions – such as the corporation – are often built on the basis of class compromises, and thus internalize class contradictions as well.

Articulating a coherent IM theoretical problematic requires us to supplement the Marxist notion of *class position* (defined

in terms of objective relations to the means of production) with Max Weber’s (1915, 1921) concept of *class situation*. Through this lens, social classes are comprised of overlapping types defined and reproduced by the institutional formations into which class actors are organized. These institutions form intra-class hierarchies even as they shape the balance of force between classes, securing the dominance of specific strata or groups *within classes* who then exert historical agency as a function of the institutional capacities they command. In other words, while never shedding their class position, agents occupy specific class situations by virtue of their institutional localities, which reproduce positions of command – the power to mobilize resources and capacities. These institutions in turn shape, and are shaped by, the broader balance of class forces and the totalizing reproductive logic of capitalist social relations.

Class power, then, arises as a historical consequence of the functional integration of institutional ensembles, even as the structure and character of these is simultaneously a consequence of the balance of class forces, competitive pressures, and the contradictions of relative autonomy. This includes corporations, the state, labour unions, and so on, all of which organize class actors into specific, and often contradictory, class situations. The particular contours of these formations are the historical product of contestations between classes, but also within them – as agents in the same class position, but different class situations, struggle for command of institutional resources.

The methodology that Leo Panitch and Sam Gindin deploy in *The Making of Global Capitalism* provides the best example of an Institutional Marxist analysis. As Panitch and Gindin (2012, 342) argue, a truly historical state theory must not proceed “from an ideal-typical notion of what capitalism requires, and then assert in a functionalist manner that states must meet such requirements.” Rather, “the conceptual categories Marx developed to define the structural relationships and economic dynamics distinctive to capitalism can be enormously valuable, but only if they guide an understanding of the choices made, and the specific institutions created, by specific historical actors” (Panitch and Gindin 2012, 3). This means that understanding the unfolding of history

requires undertaking concrete research into the development of capitalism – and capitalist states – in particular contexts. The historical development of global capitalism, they write in the very first sentence of the book, “was not inevitable, but nor was it accidental” (Panitch and Gindin 2012, 25).

Conclusion

The power structure organized and reproduced by the state is constituted by emergent, relatively autonomous political and economic institutions founded on capitalist social relations. The articulation of these relations, while always capitalist, is by no means stable over time. State and corporate institutions, and the political and economic logics they embody, comprise a mutually dependent, contradictory assemblage: just as the evolution of state institutions and the policies they generate must be seen in the context of their manifold linkages with corporate power systems, corporate strategies and organizational forms – and hence the broader institutional articulation of capitalism – can only be understood by accounting for the role of the capitalist state and the more basic strata of social existence.

On this basis, we are able to identify distinct phases of capitalist development by referring to particular institutional modalities of class hegemony. Neither corporations nor the state are static “black boxes;” they are, rather, historically evolving organizational forms. Specific tendencies in state and corporate organization, and the relative prominence of different firms and sectors within the overall structure of accumulation, at different times, demarcate phases of capitalist development. Periods of development bear their own characteristic patterns as the hierarchy of state apparatuses, forms of corporate governance, and structural position of different economic sectors evolve.

To recognize fully the dialectical interplay among strata, one must trace historically the institutional development of relative autonomy, forms of competition, and manifestations of tendencies toward concentration and centralization in relation to the class structure, relations with the world market, and specific institutional forms that comprise different periods. The foundation throughout must be what Thompson called “history as process”: a relentless totalization in progress, never

complete or closed, propelled forward into each new present by the concrete antagonisms and syntheses in each situation. After all, far from simply reproducing itself as a fixed and static “structure,” or unfolding automatically as the outcome of necessary “inner laws,” capitalism is unceasingly and unpredictably created anew by concrete, living human beings embedded within and acting through specific institutional formations.

STEPHEN MAHER AND SCOTT M. AQUANNO

References

- Archer, Margaret. 1995. *Realist Social Theory: The Morphogenetic Approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 2016. *Toward a Critical Theory of States: The Poulantzas-Miliband Debate After Globalization*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Bhaskar, Roy. 1978. *A Realist Theory of Science, Second Edition*. Brighton, UK: Harvester Press.
- Cammack, Paul. 1989. “Bringing the State Back In?” *British Journal of Political Science* 19, no. 2: 261–90.
- Collier, Andrew. 1994. *Critical Realism: An Introduction to Roy Bhaskar’s Philosophy*. New York: Verso.
- Creaven, Sean. 2000. *Marxism and Critical Realism: A Materialistic Application of Realism in the Social Sciences*. New York: Routledge.
- Evans, Peter, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and Theda Skocpol, eds., 1985. *Bringing the State Back In*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jessop, Bob. 2001. “Institutional Re(turns) and the Strategic-Relational Approach,” *Environment and Planning A* 33, no. 7: 1213–35.
- Lenin, Vladimir I. 1933 [1917]. *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*. New York: International Publishers.
- Lenin, Vladimir I. 2021. [1917]. *The State and Revolution*. Garden City, N.Y.: Dover Publications.
- Maher, Stephen. 2016. “Escaping Structuralism’s Legacy: Renewing Theory and History in Historical Materialism.” *Science & Society* 80, no. 3 (July): 291–318.
- Maher, Stephen, and Scott M. Aquanno. 2018. “Conceptualizing Neoliberalism: Foundations for an Institutional Marxist Theory of Capitalism.” *New Political Science* 40, no. 1 (March): 33–50.
- Karl Marx. 1986 [1852]. “The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte.” *Marx-Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 11, 99–197. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Miliband, Ralph. 1983. *Class Power & State Power*. London: Verso.
- Miliband, Ralph. 2004 [1977]. *Marxism and Politics*. London: Merlin Press.

- Miliband, Ralph. 2009 [1969]. *The State in Capitalist Society*. London: Merlin Press.
- Panitch, Leo. 1999. "The Impoverishment of State Theory." *Socialism and Democracy* 13, no. 2: 19–35.
- Panitch, Leo, and Sam Gindin. 2012. *The Making of Global Capitalism: The Political Economy of American Empire*. London: Verso.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. 1975. *Classes in Contemporary Capitalism*. London: New Left Books.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. 1978a. *Political Power and Social Classes*. London: New Left Books.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. 1978b. *State, Power, Socialism*. London: New Left Books.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. 1968. *Search for a Method*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Thompson, E.P. 2008 [1978]. *The Poverty of Theory*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Weber, Max. 1964 [1915]. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, edited by Talcott Parsons. New York: The Free Press.
- Weber, Max. 1978 [1921]. *Economy and Society*, edited by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

11. Latino politics and Marxism

The field of Hispanic/Latino politics in the era of “postmodernity” and “globalization” has failed to address central issues in the reproduction of social inequalities. This failure is associated with the shift away from a critique of capitalism and class domination in the study of the Latina/o experience in the United States and the embrace of mainstream political perspectives on the nature of power and politics such as interest group pluralism. From the Civil Rights Era to contemporary times, Latina/o political scientists influenced by the ideas of liberalism and socialism engaged in political discussions and the analysis of American politics, but in the end this group of scholars dismissed, or in some cases retreated from, more radical and alternative critical perspectives. In the process of abandoning critical perspectives such as Marxism and the theory of internal colonialism, critical scholars permitted the proliferation and the triumph of a liberal-pluralist conception of the Latina/o experience.

This chapter explores the experience of the Mexican origin population, the largest subgroup of the Latina/o community in the United States and it traces the theoretical interpretations that led to the retreat and dismissal of critical studies about the capitalist state. First, it examines the nature of the early interpretations of the Latina/o experience, identifying the most important concepts in the analysis of inequality in the United States. The second section presents the emergence of a critical body of literature that challenges the validity of the cultural models dominant in the field of Latina/o studies. Finally, it proposes the development of a theoretical interpretation of this political experience grounded in the centrality of the concept of the capitalist state and a class analysis of the Latina/o experience in the United States.

The origins of Hispanic/Latina/o politics

It is now common to read political analyses of the Latina/o population, which is the largest ethnic/racial minority in the United States, but there was a paucity of studies on the political experience of Mexicans, Puerto Ricans,

Cuban Americans, and other Latinos until the late 1960s and early 1970s. However, at the height of the Chicano civil rights movement during this time, scholars increasingly produced interpretive essays on the political condition of the Mexican origin population in the United States. Chicano scholars, who were dissatisfied with the prevailing views of the political life of their community, began articulating alternative perspectives on the nature of politics and power in the United States. While Chicano political scientists generated a diversity of interpretations, the model of internal colonialism was the dominant emerging perspective at this time (Garcia and de la Garza 1977).

In 1972 Chicano political scientists proposed this alternative perspective in an essay titled “The Barrio as an Internal Colony,” which rejected the traditional liberal pluralist interpretations of politics. Influenced by the radical intellectual tradition in Latin America and Africa, as well as by African American political thought, the Chicano version of the “internal colonial” model suggested that the Chicano experience differed from the European immigrant experience in at least four major ways: (1) forced entry, (2) cultural impact, (3) external administration, and (4) racism. The theory of internal colonialism suggested that the political experience of Chicanos in the United States was that of a colonized people comparable to that experienced in other parts of Latin America and Africa. However, the experience of Chicanos in the United States did not follow the classical pattern of colonialism because the population in Chicano communities became part of internal colonies within the United States, rather than an occupied foreign country.

From a political perspective, the theory posited that the internal colonization of the Chicano population was established through the exclusion of the population from governmental bodies and political parties, as well as the alienation of the population from governmental agencies. Moreover, other mechanisms of domination exacerbated the condition of powerlessness, ranging from the use of repressive measures against the population, the application of legal barriers to political participation (poll taxes, literacy tests, etc.), the dilution of their electoral influence via the use of gerrymandered legislative and congressional districts, and a strategy of divide and conquer that relied on the

cooptation of colonized leaders into the economic and political structures of domination. More significant, the theory suggested the existence of power beyond the visible and observable; namely, a "third dimensional" view of power involving the manipulation of symbols to reinforce the mechanisms of control and domination (Lukes 2005). Just as important, the theory of internal colonialism identified the important roles played by schools and the media, which subordinated the population ideologically. Given the political powerlessness of the Chicano population, the theory of internal colonialism posited the need for wide-ranging structural changes to decolonize Chicano communities, including Chicano control of their environment and local political institutions (Barrera et al. 1972).

While the theory of internal colonialism challenged the dominant pluralist narrative of American society, a major weakness of the theory was its lack of clarity in the application of conceptual tools to the political analysis of the Chicano community. This is clearly illustrated in the use of such terms as the "political system" and "interest groups," which theorists used to elucidate the theory of internal colonization by grounding their arguments in the language of the liberal pluralist model, that is, the lack of representation or participation of Chicanas/os in political parties and government agencies. Finally, the theory drew attention to the historical role of racism in the United States and the over-utilization of the concept of "race" as the defining conceptual tool in the interpretation of oppression, which weakened the analytical power of the theory in relation to pluralism.

Among the various publications of the era, the *Aztlán* special issue, *Politics and the Chicano*, is exemplary of the directions and status of the literature on the political experience of the Latina/o community, and more specifically, the Mexican origin population in the American Southwest. An examination of the articles in the journal revealed an emerging field afflicted with contradictory theoretical approaches, methodological experimentation, and the search for a space in the discipline of political science. Already in the small body of academic literature that had appeared during the late 1960s and early 1970s, the diversity of political interpretations included studies uti-

lizing approaches and methodologies ranging from liberal pluralist interpretations to the theory of internal colonialism, which compared the Latino/a experience to the colonial experience of people in the Third World, as well as early efforts to articulate the possible intersections between race, class, and gender.

Liberal pluralism and the triumphalism of capitalism

With the demise of the early Chicano political science, especially its variants of the internal colonial models of the late 1960s and early 1970s, the field of Chicano politics and its later reincarnations as Hispanic and/or Latina/o politics underwent a theoretical transformation. A theoretical direction grounded in the traditional and dominant liberal pluralist view of politics became the norm as it came to guide and define most political analyses of the Latina/o community. Typical research agendas focused on political culture and socialization, participation in voting, interest groups, political parties, political representation, and the institutions of government (national, state, and local levels). More significant, this group of Hispanic scholars failed to challenge the assumptions of the pluralist theoretical model and instead embraced these assumptions as self-evident truths that accurately described the social reality of the Latino community in the United States.

The pluralist perspective made several assertions about the political condition of Latinos in the United States. First, pluralists argued that the political system contained multiple centers of power and thus power is widely dispersed among different groups in society. These multiple centers of power are not entirely sovereign and, consequently, pluralist scholars articulated an interest group model of politics. Second, pluralists argued that all interest groups can apply pressure along many points in the decision-making process of the political system. In other words, there are multiple access points in government for Latinos to promote their political agenda. Third, due to the dispersal of power in the American political system, and the specific characteristics of the bargaining and negotiation process, political change is gradual or incremental. In the end, this theoretical direction produced a body of literature and scholarship that mirrored the mainstream

study of politics in the United States and, thus, it constituted a retreat from the earlier critical perspectives of power and politics. Moreover, the research findings of this theoretical approach led to proposed solutions to the problems faced by Latinos/as that were grounded in accepting and embracing capitalist ideology as epitomized in the concept of "the American Dream" (Garcia and Sanchez, 2007).

Globalization and the postmodern turn

By the 1980s, the theoretical debate underwent another change with the introduction of postmodernist theory. This new shift in the theoretical debate initiated an intellectual movement that was profoundly critical of the "old Chicano Studies" as postmodernists derisively referred to earlier writings and perspectives. Postmodernism is a theoretical perspective rooted in a critique of modernity. Gutierrez (2000, 92), who is a postmodernist writer stated the critique succinctly:

The old economic and political certitudes of the 1950s have crumbled. Capitalism has been denationalized and has taken a more global and more mobile form. Just about everywhere, communism has been eclipsed. And from our own postmodern condition and perspectives, many proclaim the exhaustion of Enlightenment tenets and modernity's failure.

Due to the diversity of the postmodernist literature, it is difficult to identify the basic thrust of this perspective. Nevertheless, Chicana and Chicano postmodernists propose a research agenda that raises new and old questions informed by different assumptions about the contemporary social order. Postmodernists are critical of the role of the researcher and the conduct of research as they skeptically re-examined the concepts of objectivity, science, and truth. Postmodernists called attention to dramatic changes in the world, including globalization and the denationalization of capital. Postmodernists also focused on "complex subject positions," which emphasized the intersectionality of the Chicana/o experience and a critique of what postmodernists call the "Them vs. Us" dichotomy (Gutierrez 2000; Vasquez 1992).

While postmodernist research provided new insights and raised new questions about

the scholarship of the previous Chicana and Chicano generation, it also shifted attention away from the original questions posed by that early research. This shift was not unique to the field of Chicana/o Studies. In the 1980s, the social sciences underwent similar changes in the search for a new paradigm, but it moved research and researchers away from critical perspectives on the nature of Latina and Latino oppression. For example, in reference to theories of the state and social class, radical political scientists posit that the conservative shift inside and outside the academy affected the study of Marxist state theory. This conservative shift among leftist intellectuals has been affected by the alleged decline of the state articulated in the scholarship on "globalization." In the process, some leftist intellectuals have retreated from the study of "political power" to a more disaggregated vision of power as a dispersed and undifferentiated phenomenon (Aranowitz and Bratsis 2002, xi). Best and Kellner (1991, 276) describe the current condition affecting research as the "postie syndrome." Best and Kellner (1991, 276) conclude by questioning whether the break from modernity to postmodernity is so radical and whether the break negates the utility of Marxism and other critical perspectives of the modern condition. Ellen Wood's (1995, 1) observations work perfectly to expose the tendencies within contemporary Latina/o Studies scholarship:

Capitalist triumphalism on the right is mirrored on the left by a sharp contraction of socialist aspirations. Left intellectuals, if not embracing capitalism as the best of all possible worlds, hope for little more than a space in its interstices and look forward to only the most local and particular resistances.

These shifts resulted, in part, from the influence of the new field of cultural studies and the strong postmodernist theoretical orientation of that scholarship. Even though this literature purports to critique the current conditions affecting oppressed minorities, it diverts attention away from a critique of capitalism and obscures the structural nature of oppression. The shift away from the study of capitalism and class domination is a characteristic of most contemporary Latina/o Studies scholarship. We argue it is important to recover those traditions grounded in a materialist interpretation of the political

experience of the Latina/o community, with a special focus on the centrality of theories of the state and social class.

Radical theories on the Latina/o experience: The Marxist turn

A renewed interest in Marxist interpretations of the Latina/o experience in the United States has emerged in contemporary studies of history, political economy, and the interconnections between literature and culture. Some early studies of the historical experience of the Latino community challenged the foundations of the internal colonial model from a materialist perspective regarding the nature of power relations and inequality. Gonzalez (1974) proposed one of the early materialist critiques of the internal colonial model and concluded its eclectic integration of Marxist theory with non-Marxist perspectives failed to address the complexities of the political experience of the Chicana/o community and other minorities in the United States. The internal colonial model was subjected to a critical analysis of its concepts such as the nation, nation-state, and national minority, which were concepts associated with early Marxist debates on the National Question. While incorporating questions about the exploitation of the Chicana/o community and raising the importance of the national question, Gonzalez (1974, 160) concluded that the theory of internal colonialism "does not place into proper perspective the questions of class, race (and ignores sexual) exploitation. In the long run the contradictions of the theory are such that it would be of little or no use in the destruction of racism and exploitation."

Thus, in *A Century of Chicano History* (2003), Gonzalez and Fernandez proposed a radically alternative perspective grounded in a materialist interpretation of the roots of the Mexican American community in the United States and which developed a revised historical periodization under modern corporate capitalism. Chicanos played a central role in the establishment of a hegemonic American empire "characterized by a neo-colonial style of direct economic domination over Mexico as well as other countries." This process caused the weakening of the sovereignty of the Mexican nation and the eventual demographic participation of Mexico's population in the creation of the U.S. national economy

under monopoly capitalism (Gonzalez and Fernandez 2013, xi–xv).

Fernandez also proposed an alternative perspective on the historical formation of the U.S.-Mexico border region in his early study, *The US Mexico Border: A Political Economic Profile* (1977) and in his later study, *The Mexican American Border Region* (1989). While recognizing modifications in methodology, both studies re-asserted the centrality of a political economy approach, which "brings cohesiveness and coherence to the material analysed in this monograph" and it examines "long term economic foundations at its totality as a socio-economic region, and its interrelationships and its history" (Fernandez 1989, 4–5). Moreover, the central premises of Fernandez's (1989, 5–6) political economy approach are (1) "the role of material factors as the key to long term economic development," (2) the adoption of "a global perspective that established conditions between data found in other studies on the region," and (3) "a historical inter-disciplinary perspective on economic development."

Similarly, Maria Linda Apodaca (1977), who is one of the most important Chicana scholar/activists during the Movement of the early 1970s, critically examines the historical context of women in the development of the Mexican origin community through an analysis of the various modes of production from ancient Aztec society to Spanish feudalism to contemporary capitalism and imperialism. The basic thrust of her (1977, 72–3) analysis is that:

For women of various historical working classes as well as for the Chicana, class analysis allows one to understand: 1. The expropriation of their labor power and that of their families; 2. Man's supremacy in the home and society; 3. Society's denial of their importance in social production.

In the field of literature and culture, Chicana/o scholars established a tradition that was critical of all forms of literary criticism, but more specifically they proposed Marxist or materialist interpretations of the Chicana/o experience. In "Post Modernism, Historical Materialism and the Chicana/o Cultural Studies," Gonzalez (2004) presents an examination of Chicana/o literary criticism and criticizes the limitations of postmodernist theory by focusing on the concepts of cultural schizo-

phrenia and heterotopias. These concepts have been used by critics to examine and explain the notion of “ideological ambivalence” in Chicano literature; namely, “the characterization of human subjects that vacillate between different languages, cultures, countries, and classes, caught up in a state of perpetual between-ness, articulated through such concepts as ‘borderlands thinking’” (Gonzalez 2004, 164). After an examination of the post-modernist tendencies in Chicana/o literary criticism, and the application of Marxism and historical materialism, Gonzalez identifies problems in postmodern theory, including its antagonism to history and class analysis, its failure to analyse ambivalence as “the product of capitalist exploitation,” its mystification of social relations, and its flawed interpretation of the literary ambivalence as subversive, rather than a product of capitalist exploitation (Gonzalez 2004). More recently, in *Dialectical Imaginaries*, Gonzalez and Borrego (2018) continue to develop this line of thought by presenting essays in critical Latina/o literature with a Marxist theoretical base that involve a critique of capitalism and materialist analyses of socio-economic injustices. Gonzalez and Borrego correlate the impact of conservative literary trends during the 1980s with the demise of the concept of class in literary interpretations and the subsequent impact of neoliberalism’s “there is no alternative” triumph of capitalism. Nevertheless, Gonzalez and Barrego (2018) identify a body of literary criticism grounded in Marxist ideas and social theory that incorporates writers such as Georg Lukacs, Theodore Adorno, Louis Althusser, Antonio Gramsci, and Frederic Jameson.

Class, power, and the state in Latino politics

In political science, Chicano Studies scholars proposed early critical studies of the nature of power and inequality that applied a Marxist perspective to the political experience of the Chicana/o community. An alternative interpretation emerged that emphasized the centrality of class and the role of the state in the analysis of political power. For example, Munoz (1974) explored the role of the capitalist state in the context of the politics of Chicano student protests in California. Munoz drew on the theoretical work of Ralph Miliband (1969) to examine Chicano student

protest as a way of revealing the repressive character of the capitalist state, including the specific actions of COINTELPRO (FBI Counterintelligence Program). Besides analysing the repressive character of the capitalist state, the Munoz’s study argued that the power of the state also manifested itself in the educational system as an ideological state apparatus (Althusser 1971).

Cervantes (1977, 129) also challenged the dominance of the internal colonial model in the early study of politics and power in the Chicano community and proposed a Marxist critique of the community as a post-colonial minority:

the contemporary situation can more usefully be conceptualized as being in a state of post-colonial development which, as the term implies must be understood within the dialectical context of its colonial experience. It is a legacy of colonialism that manifests itself in various post-colonial structures of economic and racial-cultural dependencies.

Cervantes (1977, 133) concluded that the Chicano experience of “resistance, struggle, and exploitation” is best understood “as a legacy of colonialism rather than as an example of internal colonialism.”

In *Race and Class in the Southwest*, Barrera (1979) also advanced a Marxist analysis of political power in the Chicana/o community. Barrera’s work made revisions to the internal colonial model, but importantly he insisted on the necessity of including a concept of the capitalist state as part of the analysis. More specifically, Barrera explored the connections between the capitalist state and the management of labor and immigration. Barrera drew on the work of the major participants in the Marxist “state debate” to analyse the role of the state in creating, maintaining, and changing the structure of inequality that characterizes the situation of Chicanos in American society. Barrera (1979) presents an analysis of politics and political power that privileges the central role of the state and social classes, rather than the study of interest groups or elites.

Similarly, Santillan (1979) presented an early critique of pluralism and proposed a political economy approach as an alternative form of analysing the Chicana/o political experience. According to Santillan, the politics of assimilation, cultural democracy,

and cultural nationalism are really just examples of the pluralist conception of politics in the United States. Santillan concludes that political strategies formulated using pluralist conceptions of politics fail to resolve the fundamental issues of class, national, and sexual discrimination that afflict the Chicana/o community. Santillan's early work not only proposed a radical political economy approach to understanding the Chicana/o experience, but argued for an intersectional perspective that simultaneously incorporates class, sex, and nationality into any analysis of Chicana/o politics and culture. However, despite making a strong case for the political economy approach and intersectionality, Santillan fails to present a clear trajectory for a Marxist/Chicana/o politics.

Contemporary critiques of the theoretical direction of research and scholarship in the field of Latina/o Studies provides a renewed basis for the return to a materialist perspective on the Chicana/o experience. For instance, in *After Race: Racism after Multiculturalism* (2004), Darder and Torres (2004, 17) adopt a historical materialist approach that recognizes the linkage of all types of oppression to "the material domination and exploitation of populations, in the interest of perpetuating a deeply entrenched capitalist system of world dominion, which serves as the impetus for the construction of social formations of inequality." Darder and Torres plead for a renewed focus on the capitalist state as it remains a concept that is largely ignored in Latina/o political scholarship. An exception to this tendency is *Savage State: Welfare Capitalism and Inequality* (Martin and Torres 2004). The critical analysis of state policies in contemporary society by Martin and Torres analyses the continuous attacks on labor unions, anti-immigrant policies, anti-affirmative action policies, anti-bilingual education programs, and the privatization of education and health services by the U.S. state over the last four decades. When one focuses on concrete public policies that directly affect Latinas/os, Darder and Torres (2004, 139) argue that "the nature of the state must be fully interrogated as a site of conflict and counter-hegemonic struggle." Darder and Torres insist that such an approach must also analyse the role of the ideological state apparatus by challenging the philosophical assumptions and political interests of public policy makers. Darder

and Torres argue that students of critical approaches to public policy should address the daily life of people in their research, including economic well-being, health care, housing, and the education of children.

More recently, Ibarra, Carlos, and Torres (2018) published a penetrating (and APSA award winning) book, *The Latino Question: Politics, Labouring Classes, and the Next Left*. This book interrogates the role of the capitalist political economy in facilitating the growth of economic inequality, the migration of Latinos to the north, the limits of electoral politics, and, most importantly, the rarely explored issue of expanding class divisions within Latino communities across the United States. The book also brings attention to the rarely discussed work in radical political economy by Ernesto Galarza (1969, 1977). Galarza (1971) is a radical urban planner and community activist whose work led to the end of the Bracero Program and contributed to building local neighborhoods and democratic initiatives in California. The work by Ibarra, Carlos, and Torres (2018) also advances a Marxist critique against those on the "Left," including mainstream democratic activists and operatives, who advance a race reductionist fiction as evident in their verbal assaults on the 2020 U.S. Presidential candidate Bernie Sanders and his "non-racial" initiatives such as universal programs on climate change, health care, environmental protection, and housing justice, among other issues. Ibarra, Carlos, and Torres argue that these mainstream voices can still be heard today in the Biden administration. Finally, the *Latino Question's* main argument is that so-called Latino politics must be embedded in a critique of capitalist political economy and a wider social movement to advance an alternative democratic future.

In this chapter, we claim that a concept of state power is central to understanding Mexican American politics and other U.S. born Latina/o communities, which focuses research on the question of political and class struggle. We conclude by agreeing with Alex Callinicos (2004, 60) that "any study of politics which detaches the apparatus of the state power from their 'foundations' in the forces and relations of production can offer only partial and one-sided insights, but any study which ignores these apparatuses simply misses the point." This observation applies

most certainly to Latina/o politics in capitalist America.

GILBERTO GARCIA AND RODOLFO D. TORRES

References

- Althusser, Louis. 1971. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses: Notes Towards an Investigation." In *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, 127–86. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Apodaca, Maria Linda. 1977. "The Chicana Woman: An Historical Materialist Perspective." *Latin American Perspectives*, 4, nos. 1–2: 70–89.
- Aronowitz, Stanly and Peter Bratsis. 2002. *Paradigm Lost: State Theory Reconsidered*. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press.
- Barrera, Mario. 1979. *Race and Class in the Southwest*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Barrera, Mario, Carlos Munoz, and Charles Ornelas. 1972. "The Barrio as an Internal Colony." *Urban Affairs Annual Review*. 6:465–98.
- Best, Steven, and Douglas Kellner. 1991. *Post Modern Theory: Critical Interrogations*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Callinicos, Alex. 2004. *Making History: Agency, Structure, and Change in Social Theory*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Cervantes, Fred A. 1977. "Chicanos as a Post-Colonial Minority: Some Questions Concerning The Adequacy of the Paradigm of Internal Colonialism." In *Perspectivas en Chicano Studies*, edited by Reynaldo Flores Macias, 123–35. Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles Chicano Studies Research Center.
- Darder, Antonia and Rodolfo D. Torres. 2004. *After Race: Racism after Multiculturalism*. New York: New York University Press.
- Fernandez, Raul. 1977. *The United States-Mexico Border: A Politico-Economic Profile*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Fernandez, Raul A. 1989. *The Mexican American Border Region: Issues and Trends*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Flores, Henry. 2003. *The Evolution of the Liberal Democratic State With a Case Study of Latinos in San Antonio, Texas*. Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- Galarza, Ernesto. 1971. *Barrio Boy*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Galarza, Ernesto. 1977. *Farm Workers and Agri-business in California, 1947–1960*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Galarza, Ernesto, Herman Gallegos, and Julian Samora. 1969. *Mexican-Americans in the Southwest*. Santa Barbara, CA: McNally and Loftin.
- Garcia, F.C. and Rodolfo de la Garza. 1977. *The Chicano Political Experience: Three Perspectives*. North Scituate, MA: Duxbury Press.
- Garcia, F.C. and Gabriel Sanchez. 2007. *Hispanics and the US Political System: Moving into the Mainstream*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Gonzalez G., Gilbert. 1974. "A Critique of the Internal Colony Model." *Latin American Perspectives*, 1, 134–61.
- Gonzalez G., Gilbert, and Raul A. Fernandez. 2003. *A Century of Chicano History: Empire, Nations, and Migration*. New York: Routledge.
- Gonzalez, Marcial. 2004. "Postmodernism, Historical Materialism and Chicana/o Cultural Studies." *Science & Society*, 68, no.2 (Summer), 161–86.
- Gonzalez, Marcial and Carlos Borrego. 2018. *Dialectical Imaginaries: Materialist Approaches to U.S. Latino/a Literature in the Age of Neoliberalism*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Gutierrez, Ramon. 2000. "Chicano History: Paradigm Shifts and Shifting Boundaries." In *Voices of a New Chicana/o History*, edited by Refugio I. Rochin and Dennis N. Valdes, 91–114. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.
- Ibarra, Armando, Alfredo Carlos, and Rodolfo D. Torres. 2018. *The Latino Question: Politics, Labouring Classes and the Next Left*. London: Pluto Press.
- Jessop, Bob. 1977. "Recent Theories of the Capitalist State." *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 1, no. 4, 353–73.
- Jessop, Bob. 1982. *The Capitalist State: Marxist Theories and Methods*. New York and London: New York University Press.
- Lukes, Steven. 2005. *Power: A Radical View*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Martin, Edward J. and Rodolfo D. Torres. 2004. *Savage State: Welfare Capitalism and Inequality*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc.
- Miliband, Ralph. 1969. *The State in Capitalist Society*. New York: Basic Books.
- Miliband, Ralph. 1977. *Marxism and Politics*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Muñoz, Carlos. 1974. "The Politics of Protest and Chicano Liberation: A Case Study of Repression and Cooptation." *Aztlan* 5, no. 1–2, 119–41.
- Muñoz, Jr. Carlos. 2007. *Youth, Identity, Power: The Chicano Movement*. London: Verso.
- Santillan, Richard. 1979. "The Dialectics of Chicano Political Development: A Political Economy Perspective." *Appeal to Reason: A Journal of Marxist Theory*, 5, no. 4, 51–65.
- "Special Issue: Politics and the Chicano." 1974. *Aztlan: Chicano Journal of the Social Sciences and the Arts* 5, no. 2 (Spring–Fall).

Vasquez, Francisco H. 1992. "Chicanology: A Postmodern Analysis of Meshicano Discourse." *Perspectives in Mexican American Studies*, 3, 117–47.

Wood, Ellen Meiksins. 1995. *Democracy Against Capitalism: Renewing Historical Materialism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wood, Ellen Meiksins and John Bellamy Foster. 1997. *In Defense of History: Marxism and*

the Postmodern Agenda. New York: Monthly Review Press.

See also

Internal Colonialism; Dependency Theory

12. Open Marxism

Open Marxism (OM) emerged in the early 1990s as a response to the “crisis of Marxism” (Althusser 1978) and suggested that Marxism had become “scientistic” and “positivistic,” as well as overly “closed” and “outdated.” OM’s founders saw the problem not as a crisis of Marxism altogether, but as a crisis of a particular kind of Marxism, that is, structural Marxism, which was increasingly incapable of comprehending and confronting global capitalism in a neoliberal age. Inspired by critical theorists and Marxists like Theodor Adorno, Johannes Agnoli, Ernst Bloch, George Lukács, Rosa Luxemburg, Herbert Marcuse, Evgeny Pashukanis, and Isaak Rubin, OM posed an alternative by insisting that Marx’s critique of political economy represented a “subversive critique of the economic categories, the philosophical concepts, the moral values and the political institutions, including the form of the state, of bourgeois society” (Bonefeld 2019, x–xi). The name OM was first used as the title of a co-authored book (Mandel and Agnoli 1980), which advanced OM’s core idea that Marxism is “open” insofar as “it involves a reciprocal interrelation between the categories of theory (which interrogates practice) and of practice (which constitutes the framework for critique)” (Bonefeld, Gunn, and Psychopedis 1992, ix–xi).

OM was initially presented in three volumes edited by Werner Bonefeld, Richard Gunn, and the late Kosmas Psychopedis, respectively subtitled “Dialectics and History” (1992), “Theory and Practice” (1992) and “Emancipating Marx” (1995, also edited by John Holloway). These volumes brought together contributions by theorists associated with autonomist Marxism (Harry Cleaver, Antonio Negri), the Neue Marx-Lektüre (Hans-Georg Backhaus), state derivation debates (Joaquim Hirsch, Heidi Gerstenberger), and the Conference of Socialist Economists (Simone Clarke). *Capital & Class* and *Common Sense* provided vital outlets for open Marxist writing. The fourth volume (2019), edited by Ana C. Dinerstein, Alfonso García Vela, Edith González, and John Holloway, marked the 25th anniversary of OM’s emergence. Subtitled “Against a Closing World,” this fourth volume brought together both estab-

lished and early-career scholars, and activists from the global north and south, to re-examine key OM concepts, including class, dialectics, value, primitive accumulation, capital, and the state.

OM reads these concepts through the notion of form. Form analysis is considered “central to Marx’s discussion in *Capital*” (Holloway 1992, 164) and, for OM, it is central to understanding class struggle. In this reading, the fetishized forms in which capitalist relations appear – money, capital, interest, rent, profit – do not cloak class exploitation from those who experience it, as in the traditional Marxist base-superstructure approach. Instead, these forms are aspects of a general system of oppression – a totality. The notion of form further illuminates the transitoriness of how labor is mediated in and against capital. This transitoriness reflects that capitalist social forms are constituted in and through class struggle (Bonefeld 1994). Thus, contrary to structural Marxism, OM does not strip away social forms as a kind of false appearance overlaid upon material reality. Instead, it inquires as to what is contained within historically specific social forms. Social forms are “modes of existence” that social relations assume (theoretically and in practice).

A critical context in which OM developed its notion of form was the Conference of Socialist Economists (CSE), a non-sectarian and internationalist forum that criticized Thatcherite political economy in late-1970s Britain. The CSE analysed the relation between the domestic and international political economy in a globalizing world economy through the prism of the concept of the capitalist state. OM took inspiration from the German “state derivation” debate (e.g., Joachim Hirsch, Heide Gerstenberger) to conceptualize the state as the political form of capitalist social relations. OM saw the political and the economic not as separate spheres but distinct moments of capital as a social totality like state derivationists. The separation of social reality into spheres stands in the way of an understanding of the state as the political form of capitalist society. In this vein, Holloway and Picciotto (1977) offered a “materialist” state theory. Antonio Gramsci’s, Ralph Miliband’s, and Nicos Poulantzas’ political analyses start from the state’s analysis. These “political” theories of the state autonomize the state as an object

of study, which leads to the analytical and methodological detachment of the study of the state form from capitalist social relations. A materialist theory of the state starts from the analysis of capital as a definite form of social relations. It is a theorization grounded in Marx's assault on bourgeois attempts to analyse the economic and the political in isolation from the class relations of exploitation on which these spheres are based.

At the same time, OM also distinguished itself from state derivation theorists. Whereas the latter saw the state as logically derived from capital, OM abandoned the analytical subordination of class struggle to the "structural logic of capitalism" (Holloway 1993, 78). In this perspective, the state is the historical outcome of struggles in specific moments of capitalist development. This understanding reintegrates class antagonism into the political and economic analysis as "forms of social relations ... assumed by the basic relation of class conflict in capitalist society" (Holloway and Picciotto 1977; Clarke 1991, 121–2).

OM shares the centrality of class struggle with the autonomism of Mario Tronti and Antonio Negri. However, for OM, autonomism's inversion of the class perspective and the promotion of working-class self-valorization against capitalist valorization is flawed. It rests on the theoretical separation between capital and labor and, therefore, it neglects labor's "constitutive power" and that neither capital nor labor are unmediated "subjects in their own right" (Bonefeld 1994, 44). However, for OM, both structural Marxism and autonomism miss the inner connection between capital and labor, whereby labor exists only through its mediation in the form of being denied as capital. Social mediation, in this context, describes the succession of intermediate forms that constitute a mode of existence of labor (Gunn 1987, 57–8). To Dinerstein (2005), these forms of mediation are the "guardians of the distance" between capitalist work and emancipatory praxis. These mediations, say the law or trade unions, do not suppress class struggles but facilitate their restraint within the boundaries of capitalist social relations.

For OM, class struggle is thus intrinsic – rather than external – in the analysis of the state, as the state mediates antagonistic social relations. Accordingly, OM foregrounded "the relation between class struggle and the restructuring of capital" in its analysis of how

"the internationalisation of capital had undermined the ability of the state to serve the interests of 'national' capital" (Clarke 1991, 22–3). From this basis, open Marxists considered changes in the state form as sparked by transformations in capital accumulation to theorize the relation between the nation-state and global capital. Prior to the CSE debates, it was a popular notion that the nation-state was being weakened by global capital, exemplified in the impossibility of maintaining the Keynesian social and industrial accord in the face of increasing pressures from global capital. However, for OM theorists, the state was the political form assumed by the social relations of capital. Rather than diminishing the nation-state's stature, financialization and monetarism make nation-states compete for a portion of global capital to sustain domestic social reproduction. Debates within the CSE addressed how the global transformation of capital and the new forms of class struggle produced the crisis of Keynesianism led to the neoliberal form of the state. This latter was not the outcome of any political or economic rationality (Clarke 1988). This crisis-ridden restructuring process exposed how the political appears in a fragmented guise as a "multiplicity of apparently autonomous territorially distinct national states." The nation-state is thus, in essence, simply a "moment of the totality of capitalist social relations, or the political form of a fractured global totality of social relations in its fractured existence" (Holloway 1996, 122–4).

The OM understanding of the system of nation-states has been applied in the study of global international relations by Peter Burnham. His critique of neo-Gramscian analyses of the international order, such as that of Robert Cox, suggests that the latter "overemphasises the role of ideology in economic policy and regime formation [and] fails to specify its implicit fractionalised theories of the state" (Burnham 1991, 90). Any attempt to critically comprehend the state in an age of "globalisation," Burnham proposes, "begins by conceptualising the changing nature of relations between national states in the global economy and concludes by understanding these relations in class terms" (Burnham 1997, 150). An open Marxist perspective analyses transformations in the global political economy as state responses to "problems that have their roots in labour/capital conflict" (Burnham 1997, 150).

Rather than viewing international restructuring as the expression of the state's ideological and political autonomy, this understands it as a compulsion placed upon national states in the name of labor discipline and recomposition of the capital relation.

Over an ongoing exchange of views (Bieler, Bonefeld, Burnham and Morton 2006), the open Marxist approach to the state has been criticized by neo-Gramscian international political economists. Critics allege that OM lacks a historical periodization of capitalist development, leading to a functionalist view of the nation-state vis-à-vis capital accumulation and a weak theorization of “revolutionary change” (Bieler and Morton 2003; Bieler et al. 2010; Dönmez and Sutton 2016; Tsolakis 2010).

Responding to these critiques, OM has broadened its original focus from the state to issues of labor, class, subjectivity, and revolution. This shift was marked by the publication, in 2002, of *The Labour Debate* (Dinerstein and Neary 2002), whose title alluded to the earlier “state debate.” This book, which was edited by Ana C. Dinerstein and Mike Neary, including contributors that spanned OM and autonomism to examined labor as a real abstraction. They applied form-analysis to the transformation of the subjectivity of labor for the first time. Unlike formal abstractions, which describe by detaching themselves from the phenomena concerned, fundamental abstractions “are abstractions in and through which phenomena obtain” (Gunn 1992, 23). Marx’s social forms are real abstractions because they are not abstractions from reality but abstractions in reality (Gunn 1992; Sohn-Rethel 1978). Real abstractions embody, crystallize, contain, and reproduce the contradictions of capitalist relations of production. The idea that the subjectivity of labor as a real abstraction means that labor’s struggles must be understood as forms “in” reality, thus with the power to transform itself and its mediations (Dinerstein 2002).

Following *The Labour Debate*, John Holloway published two essential books in the first decade of the millennium, resetting subjectivity and revolution. In *Change the World without Taking Power* (2002) and *Crack Capitalism* (2010), he rephrases the traditional revolutionary question of how “to stop making capitalism” (2010, 255). He (2010, 23) suggests that revolution consti-

tutes an ongoing (present) process of refusal to power and construction of anti-power through “practical negativity.” By “practical negativity” one means “doing” that which constantly “negates an existing state of affairs.” Holloway (2010, 11) suggests that “practical negativity” creates multiple and continuous fissures in the objective mediation of human subjective activity in capitalist social forms. These represent “cracks” in the “social synthesis of capitalist society.” Instead of attempting to transform society in its totality by taking the power of the state, social movements crack the “systemic closure that gives the social cohesion a particular force and makes it very difficult to break ... the close-knit character of social cohesion in capitalist society” (Holloway 2010, 52). By restating revolution as “interstitial revolution” (Dinerstein 2018), Holloway (2010, 11) means that “[t]he only way to think of changing the world radically is as a multiplicity of interstitial movements running from the particular.”

Concerned with the necessity to understand contemporary forms of grassroots resistance, Dinerstein (2015, 2017, 2019) has disputed the Adornian focus on negation in Holloway’s work, articulating an alternative critique that embraces “critical affirmations” based on Bloch’s philosophy of hope and the Zapatistas. By establishing a clear distinction between positive autonomism and “critical affirmations,” Dinerstein argues that the latter simultaneously affirm life and negate capital. The critical theorist’s concerns with the risk of positivization of social struggles are political and cannot be theorized a priori. “Critical affirmations,” like the Zapatista’s call for the defence of life, is used to connect OM with present-day prefigurative struggles for alternative forms of social reproduction in the context of a planetary crisis. Dinerstein offers an extension of OM’s advocacy of insubordination and emancipation against capitalist forms, theorizing the struggle of labor subjectivity instead as standing at once, “in, against, and beyond” capitalist colonial and patriarchal mediations. In-against-beyond brings about different instances and forms of class struggle and engages with the possibility of creating non-capitalist mediations.

Importantly, Dinerstein’s (2002) early work on the subjectivity of labor theorized mediations to include “objective” forms such as the state, money, and the law, but

also “subjective” mediations like identities, organizations, and modes of mobilization, all of which are taken to mediate class struggle. In this way, Dinerstein conceptualizes mediations not simply as instruments of regulation, coercion, and co-optation but because they represent the modes of existence through which antagonistic capitalist social relations acquire fragile forms “in motion.” This fragility grants labor a degree of autonomy within these mediations, potentially leading to their de-mediation. Crises play a crucial role in weakening the mediations of labor subjectivity, enabling us to have fleeting glimpses of potential emancipation.

For Holloway (2010), de-mediation occurs where capitalism momentarily “cracks” through small, isolated, and sometimes individualized interventions into or abstentions from reproducing capitalist social forms like value. For Dinerstein, on the contrary, de-mediation is not synonymous with pure immediacy, impossible in a world that subsists and is reproduced through mediations like value (see Gunn 1987, 64). Instead, the notion of de-mediation gestures towards the antagonism, contradictions, and opportunities for the emergence of alternative forms of being and becoming from within the fabric of capitalism, rather than from a space of moral and political purity that suggests that there is nothing beyond negation (Dinerstein and Pitts 2021).

The focus on de-mediation returns OM to the state as a political form of the capital relation, pointing to the problem of translation, referring to how social struggles are integrated into and continuously mediated by institutional, legal, and political dynamics around the law, welfare, and money. According to Dinerstein (2015; 2017), the social struggle does not end with their “translation” into the logic of the state. First, all struggles entail a struggle over the meaning of translation, that is, translation is a struggle; second, there is a surplus utopia or “excess” that remains beyond translation, in what she calls the “beyond zone” of the radical struggle. In this “zone,” some of the radical ideas, knowledges, and practices remain untranslated into the grammar of the law, money, and state power. Dinerstein’s work on this issue in Latin America is one example of how OM forms part of a wave of empirically engaged research in political science and beyond. Other examples include

the varied work on labor, value and the state undertaken by a new generation of scholars influenced by OM (Alami 2019; Charnock 2010; Copley and Moraitis 2020; Ghiotto and Pascual 2019; Lombardozzi and Pitts 2020; O’Kane 2020; Pesterfield 2021; Pitts 2019; Warner 2019; Zanoni 2020).

ANA CECILIA DINERSTEIN, FREDERICK HARRY PITTS, AND PATRIZIA ZANONI

References

- Alami, Ilias. 2019. “Marx’s Critique of Political Economy in Economic Geography.” *Human Geography*, 12, no. 2, 65–72.
- Bieler, Andreas and Adam Morton. 2003. “Globalisation, the State and Class Struggle: A ‘Critical Economy’ Engagement with Open Marxism.” *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 5, no. 4 (November), 467–99.
- Bieler, Andreas, Werner Bonefeld, Peter Burnham, and Adam Morton. 2006. *Global Restructuring, State, Capital, and Labour: Contesting Neo-Gramscian Perspectives*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Bieler, Andreas, Ian Bruff, Adam Morton. 2010. “Acorns and Fruit: From Totalization to Periodization in the Critique of Capitalism.” *Capital & Class*, 34 no. 1, 25–37.
- Bonefeld, Werner. 1994. “Human Practice and Perversion: Beyond Autonomy and Structure.” *Common Sense*, 15, 43–42.
- Bonefeld, Werner. 2019. “Foreword.” In *Open Marxism 4. Against a Closing World*, edited by Ana Cecilia Dinerstein, Alfonso García Vela, Edith González, and John Holloway, vii–xiv. London: Pluto Press.
- Bonefeld, W., Richard Gunn, and Kosmas Psychopedis, eds. 1992a. *Open Marxism*, Volume 1. London: Pluto Press.
- Bonefeld, Werner, Richard Gunn, and Kosmas Psychopedis, eds. 1992b. *Open Marxism*, Volume 2. London: Pluto Press.
- Bonefeld, Werner, Richard Gunn, John Holloway, and Kosmas Psychopedis, eds. 1995. *Open Marxism*, Volume 3. London: Pluto Press.
- Burnham, Peter. (1991) “Neo-Gramscian Hegemony and International Order.” *Capital and Class* 15, no. 3, 73–92.
- Burnham, Peter. 1997. “Globalisation: States, Markets and Class Relations.” *Historical Materialism*, 1, no. 1, 150–60.
- Charnock, Greig. 2010. “Challenging New State Spatialities: The Open Marxism of Henri Lefebvre.” *Antipode*, 42, no. 5 (November), 1279–303.
- Clarke, Simon. 1988. *Keynesianism, Monetarism, and the Crisis of the State*. Aldershot, UK: Edward Elgar.

- Clarke, Simon., ed. 1991. *The State Debate*. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan.
- Copley, Jack and Alexis Moraitis. 2020. "Beyond the Mutual Constitution of States and Markets: On the Governance of Alienation." *New Political Economy*, 26, no. 3 (May), 490–508.
- Dinerstein, Ana Cecilia. 2002. "Regaining Materiality: Unemployment and the Invisible Subjectivity of Labour." In *The Labour Debate: An Investigation into the Theory and Reality of Capitalist Work*, edited by Dinerstein, Ana Cecilia and Mike Neary, 203–25. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Dinerstein, Ana Cecilia. 2005. "Entre el éxtasis y el desencuentro. Los desafíos de la rebelión" ("Between Ecstasy and Dis-encounter. The Challenges of the Rebellion"). In *Marxismo Abierto. Una visión Europea y Latinoamericana*, edited by Werner Bonefeld, Alberto Bonnet, and John Holloway, 147–86. Buenos Aires/Puebla: Ediciones Herramienta & Universidad de Puebla.
- Dinerstein, Ana Cecilia. 2015. *The Politics of Autonomy in Latin America: The Art of Organising Hope*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.
- Dinerstein, Ana Cecilia. 2017. "Co-construction or Prefiguration? Rethinking the 'Translation' of SSE Practices into Policy." In *Towards Just and Sustainable Economies: The Social and Solidarity Economy North and South*, edited by Peter North and Scott Cato Molly, 57–71. Bristol, UK: Policy Press.
- Dinerstein, Ana Cecilia. 2018. "John Holloway: A Theory of Interstitial Revolution." In *SAGE Handbook of Frankfurt School Critical Theory*, edited by Beverly Best, Werner Bonefeld, and Chris O' Kane, 533–49. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Dinerstein, Ana Cecilia. 2019. "A Critical Theory of Hope: Critical Affirmations Beyond Fear." In *Open Marxism 4. Against a Closing World*, edited by Ana Dinerstein, Alfonso García Vela, Edith González, and John Holloway. London and New York: Pluto Press.
- Dinerstein, Ana Cecilia and Mike Neary, eds. 2002. *The Labour Debate: An Investigation into the Theory and Reality of Capitalist Work*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Dinerstein, Ana Cecilia, García Vela, E. González, and J. Holloway, eds. 2019. *Open Marxism: Against a Closing World*, Volume 4. London: Pluto Press.
- Dinerstein, Ana Cecilia and Frederick Harry Pitts. 2021. *A World Beyond Work? Labour, Money and the Capitalist State Between Crisis and Utopia*. Bingley, UK: Emerald Press.
- Dönmez, Pinar and Alex Sutton. 2016. "Revisiting the Debate on Open Marxist Perspectives." *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 18, no. 3, 688–705.
- Ghiotto, Luciana and Rodrigo Pascual. 2019. "The State and Global Capital: Revisiting the Debate." In *Open Marxism 4. Against a Closing World*, edited by Ana Cecilia Dinerstein, Alfonso García Vela, Edith González, and John Holloway, 109–24. London and New York: Pluto Press.
- Gunn, Richard. 1987. "Marxism and Mediation." *Common Sense*, 2, 57–66.
- Gunn, Richard. 1992. "Against Historical Materialism: Marxism as First-Order Discourse." In *Open Marxism*, Volume 2, edited by Werner Bonefeld, Richard Gunn, and Kosmas Psychopedis, 1–45. London: Pluto Press.
- Holloway, John. 1992. "Crisis, Fetishism, Class Composition." In *Open Marxism*, Volume 2, edited by Werner Bonefeld, Richard Gunn, and Kosmas Psychopedis, 145–69. London: Pluto Press.
- Holloway, John. 1993. "Open Marxism, History and Class Struggle." *Common Sense*, 13, 76–86.
- Holloway, John. 1996. "Global Capital and the National State." In *Global Capital, National State, and the Politics of Money*, edited by Werner Bonefeld and John Holloway, 116–40. London: Macmillan.
- Holloway, John. 2002. *Change the World without Taking Power: The Meaning of Revolution Today*. London: Pluto Press.
- Holloway, John. 2010. *Crack Capitalism*. London: Pluto Press.
- Holloway, John and Sol Picciotto. 1977. "Capital, Crisis and the State." *Capital & Class*, 1, no. 2, 76–101.
- Lombardozi, Lorena and Frederick Harry Pitts. 2020. "Social Form, Social Reproduction and Social Policy: Basic Income, Basic Services, Basic Infrastructure." *Capital & Class*, 44, no. 4, 573–94.
- Mandel, Ernst and Johannes Agnoli. 1980. *Offener Marxismus – Ein Gespräch ueber Dogmen, Orthodoxie und die Häresie der Realität (Open Marxism: A Discussion about Doctrines, Orthodoxy & the Heresy of Reality)*. Frankfurt: Campus.
- O'Kane, Chris. 2020. "Capital, the State, and Economic Policy: Bringing Open Marxist Critical Political Economy Back into Contemporary Heterodox Economics." *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 52, no. 4, 684–92.
- Pesterfield, Chris. 2021. "Unfree Labour and the Capitalist State: An Open Marxist Analysis of the 2015 Modern Slavery Act." *Capital & Class*, 45, no. 4, 543–60.
- Pitts, Frederick Harry. 2019. "Value Form Theory, Open Marxism and the New Reading of Marx." In *Open Marxism IV: Against a Closing World*, edited by Ana Cecilia Dinerstein, Alfonso García Vela, Edith González, and John Holloway, 63–75. London and New York: Pluto Press.
- Sohn-Rethel, Alfred. 1978. *Intellectual and*

- Manual Labour: A Critique of Epistemology*. London: Macmillan.
- Tsolakis, Andreas. 2010. "Opening up Open Marxist Theories of the State: A Historical Materialist Critique." *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 12, no. 3, 387–407.
- Warner, Sam. 2019. "(Re)politicising 'the Governmental': Resisting the Industrial Relations Act 1971." *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 21, no. 3, 541–58.
- Zanoni, Patrizia. 2020. "Prefiguring Alternatives through the Articulation of Post-and Anti-capitalistic Politics: An Introduction to Three Additional Papers and a Reflection." *Organization*, 27, no. 1, 3–16.

13. Quantitative Marxism

This chapter considers the issue of using empirical analysis in Marxist analysis and it provides a brief history of its development. It reviews the modelling of Marxist variables and provides a brief overview of some of the areas where quantitative analysis has been used to useful effect, such as the tendency for the rate of profit to fall and capitalist crisis.

Marxism and empirical analysis

Marx's method of distinguishing between appearance and essence, treating economic processes as historical and social, and using a materialist dialectical form of analysis does not preclude empirical analysis. His work is extensively empirical and moves from the abstract to the concrete through the illustrative use of data. In an influential collection of papers on quantitative Marxism, Dunne (1991) outlines the historical development of empirical Marxism, starting from Gorman's (1981) review of researchers who attempted to synthesize Marxism and empirical science as an alternative to orthodox dialectical materialism.

There are in fact three types of empirical analysis: historical/institutional, the descriptive analysis of quantitative data, and statistical analysis using formal statistical modelling-probability based techniques of inference. The first two were clearly important to Marx as a glance at *Capital* will show, but the third type is less self-evident in Marx's work.

However, these three types of analysis make up the canon of quantitative Marxism, but the last still faces some critical responses despite the fact that developments in econometric methods have made them more amenable to use in Marxist analysis; for example, the development of cointegration and cointegrating vector autoregression (VAR), which allow time series analysis of long- and short-run relations. There is no obvious reason why one cannot use probabilistic methods of statistical inference in Marxist economics and some do share the techniques with orthodox analysis. Indeed, Desai (1979) argued that if the techniques of

time series analysis had been available at the time, Marx would have used them.

The bias against empirical analysis in many strands of Marxism was based on the belief that Marxist variables are non-quantifiable and non-operational in any absolute sense, which may be true, but it is also true for all theories. Theoretical constructs are never directly observed and any measurement process will include a subjective element. Operationalizing Marxist concepts is no worse than the orthodoxy: consider unemployment, demand, and equilibrium price. These are not objective and value free concepts. In the U.K., the Radical statistics group argued that data and data collection are subjective, socially produced, and ideologically non-neutral (Dorling and Simpson 1999). Even the techniques are non-neutral. Orthodoxy starts with theory and assumption, both implicit and explicit, and then moves to data collection and processing. This is the same requirement for the operationalization of Marxist theory. Indeed, in some ways, Marxist theory is more productive of quantitative implications than neoclassical economics as it relates more directly to aggregate social processes with predictions that have direct quantitative implications.

Measuring Marxist categories

There are three approaches to quantifying Marxist categories. The first is to measure a category directly. It was considered that producing value national accounts would not be possible but, in principle, producing them would be no more difficult than usual; one just needs the resources. Orthodox accounts require complex theoretical structure, assumptions, and conventions, and face severe measurement problems. It is, however, unlikely that the resource issue will be overcome.

Second, it is possible to adjust orthodox categories to bring them closer to the required Marxist categories. This requires measuring output as productive output in the sense of producing value and identifying productive and unproductive labour, as only productive labour produces value and surplus value (Wolff 1977; Paitaridis and Tsoulfidis 2012). Marxian values have been estimated from an input-output framework by Shaikh and Tonak (1994) and by adjusting national accounts data to best suit Marxist categories

(Shaikh and Tonak 1994). There has been some debate over the detail, but the aim is to get measures of constant and variable capital, surplus value, and the rate of profit, and to use them to tell an alternative story to the mainstream (Mohun 2005, 2014).

Third, one can use Marxist categories to explain the movement in orthodox statistics. There are fewer practical problems with this approach, but greater conceptual difficulties. Baran and Sweezy saw Marx's value categories as unquantifiable and replaced them with directly observable quantities by focusing on surplus rather than surplus value. Many researchers have followed this path including, Weisskopf (1979), Glyn and Sutcliffe (1972), and Armstrong, Glyn, and Harrison (1991).

In the past, orthodox economists saw the "transformation problem" as the Achilles' heel of Marxism because it prevented linking value and prices in empirical analysis. It was argued that Marx's solution was wrong and this led to a defensive response. Since that time, the static problem has been solved (in chapter 2 Dunne (1991)) and a considerable amount of empirical work has been undertaken in this vein (Steedman and Tomkins 1998). One solution was found by Sraffa, but this led to the Sraffian critique of Marxist analysis that value categories are redundant as prices of production and a uniform profit rate can be computed directly in the system. The standard commodity removes the need for value as a category (Steedman 1977; Shaikh 1984).

Profit

Analysing the rate of profit has not surprisingly been the main focus of empirical analysis by Marxists. The Law of the Tendency for the Rate of Profit to Fall (TLTRPF), is an important component of Marx's theory as it is the underlying cause of the continuing crisis-ridden path of capitalist development. An analysis of cross section data at enterprise/industry level for the U.S. found a fall in profit. Gillman (1957) identified the value categories directly with price categories, with variable capital measured by the wage bill for production workers and constant capital as the cost of materials or, when available, the amount set aside for depreciation. He found no discernible trend from 1849–1919; a slight upward trend from 1919–39, which

when adjusted for unproductive expenditure gave a downward trend in the rate of profit, with the bulk of the decline in the early part of the period.

Three groups of literature can be identified on this question. One deals with the effects of technical change on the rate of profit. There are many critics of this approach (Basu and Manolakos 2013). A second approach considers the realization crisis as a principal cause of the falling rate of profit in capitalism. A third approach looks at the effects of the changing balance of power between workers and capitalists on the rate of profit. This work has had to deal with a number of problems.

The first problem is that profits are observed in market prices and they are not the "natural" rates of classical economics. One could use trend profit but there are both conceptual and accounting problems with this approach, such as whether rent and interest are included in a measure of profit and whether the denominator should include circulating capital. There is an aggregation problem, as we normally use prices but the re-switching debate tells us that prices are not independent of the distribution of income. There is also the issue of distinguishing cycles from trends. Marx refers to the long-run, but it is not obvious what the long-run is in his work.

There is also an issue as to what the relation of the rate of profit in the price system is to the internal rate of return. The valuation of the capital stock can be measured at historic or replacement cost, depreciation needs to be measured or estimated, but it is not clear how. Also, when inflation exists, it is not clear how stock appreciation should be treated by economists. In the empirical literature, all the methods of measuring profit have been used, trying to measure the Marxian categories directly, identifying value with price categories, and adjusting the available price categories.

Weisskopf (1979) found that the long-term decline in the rate of profit from 1949 to 1975 was almost entirely attributable to a rise in the share of wages, which indicates a rise in the strength of labor. It is largely defensive in nature, not commensurate with an increase in productivity, merely more successful than capitalists. The non-financial corporate business sector U.S. post-World War II 1949–75 rate of profit declined an average of 2 percent per annum attributable to declining share of

profits in income. The 1960s was the only period when this was less important, a period of increasing profit trend. Labor pressure on the profit share led to a premature peak in the rate of profit before the rate of output and this led to a secular decline in profits. There is no evidence of a secular change in capacity utilization leading to a falling rate of profit and the rising organic composition of capital made only a small contribution.

There has been some debate over detail, such as the treatment of inventory valuation adjustment in profits, lack of error analysis, using share of profits in national income as a measure of the rate of surplus, and the issue of unproductive labour. As Weisskopf argued, if we are going to try to get close to Marx, there are lots of adjustments that should be made but it is important to start somewhere. Thus, this literature has expanded to apply regression methods to the analysis (e.g. see the contributions in Dunne 1991; Henley 1987; Dumenil and Levy 1993, 2011; Mohun, 2014; Basu 2018). Recent literature has also considered the links between profit and other indicators, such as military spending and inequality using econometric methods (Elveren 2022).

Crisis and long waves

Marxist crisis theory found an empirical form in the 1920s when Nikolai D. Kondratieff (1944) identified a number of cycles in the development of the major capitalist economies which he measured by eliminating the trend and showing the deviation from it smoothed with a nine-year moving average. This led him to identify three types of cycle: long cycles of over 50 years (25 up, 25 down); middle cycles of seven to ten years; and short cycles of three to four years. On this basis, he predicted the crisis of the 1930s, arguing that capitalism synchronized expansion through international trade. Simon Kuznets (1955, 1963) worked on “secondary secular” movements later in the 1930s, including some physical data (one criticism of Kondratieff). He found waves, but of shorter periodicity and questioned whether they were major cycles or “specific historical occurrences.”

The most influential and supportive work was that of Schumpeter, who popularized Kondratieff’s work and assigned a central role to technological progress. Supporting the basic Kondratieff long waves over 50

years, he tied this to the emergence and rapid growth of new industrial activities, which were initiated by radical innovations. Downswings were then due to exhaustion, which implied that radical innovations and entrepreneurial dynamism were clustered rather than randomly distributed across time.

Interest in long cycles has a tendency to be higher in the downturns, so interest in this type of analysis declined with the post-World War II boom. The crisis of the 1970s saw interest again turn to explaining the fundamental changes that had taken place, beyond the orthodox economists’ focus on the impact of exogenous oil price shocks. Researchers concerned with technology looked for a more complex understanding of the end of what was termed the “Golden Age” of capitalism beyond the simple orthodox arguments of shocks and endogenous growth (Glyn et al. 1990).

In the U.S., Baran and Sweezy (1966) used price data as representative of value to analyse the development of U.S. capital. They identified a phase of Monopoly Capitalism with an underconsumption crisis in post-World War II U.S. that was dealt with by the growth of military spending, which increased consumption without increasing output. Other Marxist scholars accepted the long-wave analysis but saw the post-war period as creating a “permanent arms” economy (Kidron 1967; Melman 1974) with U.S. hegemony and the Cold War stand-off supporting international capitalism. Kidron (1970) saw military spending as depriving capitalism of resources that would otherwise be used productively, and by slowing the growth of the organic composition of capital (the capital-to-labour ratio in value terms) it retarded the fall in the value rate of profit. In contrast, Mandel (1978) argued the high organic composition of capital in military production did affect the rest of the economy and accelerated the decline in the (value) rate of profit.

The French Regulation school developed a version of Marx’s crisis theory, where a mode of regulation coordinated production and consumption and thus dealt with the contradictions between the forces of production and the social relations of production. The post-war boom was a combination of “Fordist” methods of production and consumption (i.e. mass production and consumption). In a dialectical process similar to that of Marx, the development of a particular regime

of accumulation is not harmonious and contains the seed of its own destruction. The end of the post-war boom led to “post-Fordism” and a shift to more intensive methods of production (Boyer and Saillard 2002).

In the U.S., the social structures of accumulation (SSA) school provided a similar analysis, but more of a structural model of crisis, with more emphasis on institutions. Bowles et al. (1984) saw an accord between capital and labour, with an industrial structure and technology that allowed prosperity in the U.S., although one that was country- and historically specific. The rise and demise of SSA led to long waves and they used this framework to explain the development and breakdown of the US economic boom.

Finance

Recent crises have been linked to the financial sector in a manner that has given some difficulty to mainstream economists. Heterodox economists have brought in Minsky cycles to explain the observed financial crises, but Marxists have provided a more compelling analysis. Finance has penetrated all commercial relations, with the number, variety, and monetary value of marketable financial instruments, particularly securitized instruments, has grown significantly in recent years (Fine 2008). This “financialisation” has been linked to an anomaly in calculations of the profit rate as it usually takes no account of the capital tied up in these instruments (Freeman 2013).

Conclusions

Quantitative Marxism is now an established research stream, that has become both productive and influential. It is clear that Marxian economics has nothing to fear from a confrontation with empirical data. The developments in research on the construction and interpretation of available data has been important and provided a platform for analysis. At the same time the growth of computing power and statistical tools and techniques has provided an opportunity that some researchers have been quick to grasp. This has potentially made Marxist scholarship more able to engage with mainstream economics, particularly as it occurs when disappointment with the existing theories has led to strong calls for plurality and alternatives

to the mainstream. This has resulted from crisis and inequality and the clear failures of International Monetary Fund/World Bank structural adjustment policies and this failure has nowhere been more apparent than in the shamble of Eastern Europe’s transitions to the “free market.”

At the same time, however, the development of experimental methods in microeconomics and development economics provides an alternative that tends to depoliticize development, while accepting the old criticisms has simply led to marginal adjustments to the mainstream rather than the ascendancy of alternative paradigms. However, heterodox economics is in a stronger position than it has been for many years. This could lead to a more insightful understanding of the dynamics of capitalism and its dependence on exploitation and inequality.

JOHN PAUL DUNNE

References

- Armstrong, P., Andrew Glyn, and John Harrison. 1991. *Capitalism Since 1945*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.
- Baran, P.A. and P.M. Sweezy. 1966. *Monopoly Capital: An Essay on the American Economic and Social Order*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Basu, D. 2018. “Quantitative Empirical Research in Marxist Political Economy.” In *Analytical Political Economy*, edited by R. Veneziani and L. Zamparelli, 237–68. Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley and Sons.
- Basu, D. and Manolacos, P.T. 2013. “Is there a Tendency for the Rate of Profit to Fall? Econometric Evidence from the US Economy, 1948–2007.” *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 45, no. 1, 75–94.
- Basu, D. and Vasudevan, R. 2013. “Technology, Distribution and the Rate of Profit: Understanding the Current Crisis.” *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 37, no. 1, 57–89.
- Bowles, S., D.M. Gordon, and T.E. Weisskopf. 1984. *Beyond the Wasteland: A Democratic Alternative to Economic Decline*. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Press/Doubleday.
- Boyer, R. and Y. Saillard, eds. 2002. *Regulation Theory: The State of the Art*. New York: Routledge.
- Desai, Meghnad. 1979. *Marxian Economics*. Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Dumenil, G. and Levy, D. 1993. *The Economics of the Profit Rate: Competition, Crises, and Historical Tendencies in Capitalism*. Aldershot, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

- Dumenil, G. and Levy, D. 2011. *The Crisis of Neoliberalism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Dunne, P. ed. 1991. *Quantitative Marxism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Elveren, A.Y. 2022. "Military Spending and Profit Rate: A Circuit of Capital Model with a Military Sector." *Defence and Peace Economics*, 33, no. 1, 59–76.
- Fine, B. 2008. "From Financialisation to Neo-liberalism." *Journal of Economics*, 11, no. 2, 133–64.
- Freeman, A. 2013. "The Profit Rate in the Presence of Financial Markets: A Necessary Correction." *Journal of Australian Political Economy*, 70 (January), 167–92.
- Gillman, J. 1957. *The Falling Rate of Profit*. London: Dennis Dobson.
- Glyn, A. and B. Sutcliffe. 1972. *Capitalism in Crisis*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Glyn, A., A. Hughes, A. Lipietz, and A. Singh. 1990. "The Rise and Fall of the Golden Age?" In *The Golden Age of Capitalism*, edited by Marglin and J.B. Schor, 39–125. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gorman R.A. 1981. Empirical Marxism. History and Theory, Studies in the Philosophy of History, no. 20, 403–23.
- Henley, A. 1987. "Labour's Share and Profitability Crisis in the US: Recent Experience and Post-War Trends." *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 11, no. 4, 315–30.
- Kidron, M. 1967. "A Permanent Arms Economy." *International Socialism*, 28 (Spring), 8–12.
- Kidron, M. 1970. *Western Capitalism Since the War*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Kondratieff, N.D. 1944. *The Long Waves in Economic Life*. New York: Foundation for the Study of Cycles.
- Kuznets, S. 1955. "Economic Growth and Income Inequality." *American Economic Review*, 45 (March), 1–28.
- Kuznets, S. 1963. "Quantitative Aspects of the Economic Growth of Nations, VIII: The Distribution of Income by Size." *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 11, 1–92.
- Mandel, E. 1978. *Late Capitalism*. London: Verso.
- Melman, S. 1974. *The Permanent War Economy: American Capitalism in Decline*. New York, Simon and Schuster.
- Mohun, S. 2005. "On Measuring the Wealth of Nations: The US Economy, 1964–2001." *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 29, no. 5, 799–815.
- Mohun, S. 2014. "Unproductive Labour in the US economy, 1964–2010." *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 46, no. 3, 355–79.
- Paitaridis, D. and Tsoulfidis, L. 2012. The Growth of Unproductive Activities, the Rate of Profit, and the Phase-Change of the U.S. Economy." *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 44, no. 2, 213–33.
- Shaikh, A. 1984. "The Transformation from Marx to Sraffa." In *Ricardo, Marx, Sraffa*, edited By E. Mandel and A. Freeman, 43–84. London: Verso.
- Shaikh, A. and E.A. Tonak. 1994. *Measuring the Wealth of Nations: The Political Economy of National Accounts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Steedman, I. 1977. *Marx after Sraffa*. London: New Left Books.
- Steedman, I. and Tomkins, J. 1998. "On Measuring the Deviations of Prices from Values." *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 22, no. 3, 379–85.
- Weisskopf, T.E. 1979. "Marxian Crisis Theory and the Rate of Profit in the Post-War U.S. Economy." *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 3, no. 4, 341–78.
- Wolff, E.N. 1977. "Unproductive Labour and the Rate of Surplus Value in the United States, 1947–67." In *Research in Political Economy*, Vol. 1, edited by P. Zarembka, 87–115. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Selected readings

- Bakir, E. and A. Campbell. 2009. "The Effect of Neoliberalism on the Fall in the Rate of Profit in Business Cycles." *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 38, no. 3, 365–73.
- Norton B. 1988. "Epochs and Essences: A Review of Marxist Long Wave and Stagnationist Theories." *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 12, 203–24.
- Petrovic, P. 1987. "The Deviation of Production Prices from Labour Values: Some Methodology and Empirical Evidence." *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 11, no. 3, 197–210.
- Semmler, W. 1982. "Competition, Monopoly and Differentials of Profit Rates: Theoretical Considerations and Empirical Evidence." *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 15, no. 2, 125–33.

See also

James O'Connor; Commodity Fetishism; Mode of Production; Paul Baran; Paul Sweezy

14. Structural Marxism

The term “structural Marxism” is a bit of a misnomer as it arose at a particular time in relation to a critique of a particular version of Marxist thinking, where those elements of Marx’s corpus that emphasize the ways in which institutions, practices, traditions, and other larger-than-individual “structures” are foregrounded as opposed to those other parts of Marx’s writings that emphasize the ways that individuals and collectives (or classes) are able to intervene in the course of history as active agents seeking social, political, and economic change. The term is a misnomer because there is a sense in which all Marxist theorizing is at least partially structural – all Marxists are in some ways structural Marxists – as one of the key features of Marxism is a recognition of the ways that material social and economic structures are largely durable and exist beyond and before our individual existence. This durability is at least partially determinative of both individual and collective lives in ways that are beyond our control and so constrain individual agency. There are many places in Marx’s writings where he makes exactly this point; for example, the famous passage in the *Eighteenth Brumaire*, where Marx (2000, 329) writes that: “Men make their own history, but they do not make it as they please; they do not make it under self-selected circumstances, but under circumstances existing already, given and transmitted from the past.”

Similarly, in the 1867 Preface to volume one of *Capital*, Marx and Engels (1967, 10) write that “Individuals are dealt with here only insofar as they are personifications of economic categories, the bearers of particular class-relations and class-interests.” These are examples of what many have pointed out are Marx’s commitments to the importance and determinative power of economic and social structures and his rejection of methodological individualism, along with a concomitant – for some Marxists anyway – rejection of the concept of agency. We can begin to see what we mean by structuralism in Marx – though not quite yet what we mean by “structural Marxism” – the idea that larger-than-structures are what matter, or play an outsized role, in social explanation and social analysis. In understanding such structures, we can understand how things like

exploitation and oppression function under historical conditions, where certain sets of economic and social structures exist that reinforce and reproduce exploitation. This is a core of Marxist social critique, and so some account of structure is always at play in Marxism.

However, this is not the totality of what the concept of “structural Marxism” means in contemporary political theory. As noted at the outset, this term was given to a particular subset of Marxist thinkers who rose to prominence in the middle of the twentieth century and are associated with the thought of French Marxist philosopher Louis Althusser. As Warren Montag (2013, 15) points out, “structural Marxism” is a thing of the past, a moment in time in which Althusser and others in his circle made use of concepts and ideas circulating in other academic discourse – in linguistics, and anthropology for instance – to help fit Marxism to a particular moment in the French academy in which “Structuralism” as a movement across a number of disciplines was on the rise.

Structuralism

Structuralism more broadly emerges in the middle of the twentieth century across a number of fields such as literary theory, anthropology, psychoanalysis and psychology, philosophy, and history and applies the insights of Ferdinand De Saussure’s structural linguistics to the analysis of social life and literature. Structural linguistics as defined by the work of Saussure and others holds that linguistic signs have no meaning or reference outside of the definition given to them by their relation to other signs in each linguistic system. That is, individual signs are themselves arbitrary outside this system and that there is an arbitrary relation between the signifier – the word – and the signified – the concept the word is referencing. In order to understand the meaning and function of linguistic signs, one has to understand the relations between words and the structures that are created by those relations. In laying out this theory, Saussure rejects diachronic, or historico-evolutionary accounts of linguistic analysis in favor of synchronic, or a static systems approach to such analysis.

Saussure distinguishes between “*la langue*” (language) and “*parole*” (speech). The former – *la langue* – are the struc-

tural relations between signs in a system that animate the meanings of those signs as described above, and the latter – *parole* – is the way individual language users make use of those signs in everyday usage (Saussure 2013, 84–5). This idea becomes important for the structuralisms that come after and out of Saussure’s theory; namely, that *parole* is conditioned and determined by *la langue*. Thus, the speaking subject is determined in their speech acts not solely by their own choice or will, but by the structure of the language system they are using at the time.

Stuart Hall notes the importance of this distinction in helping Claude Levi-Strauss, a structuralist anthropologist who, along with Durkhiem and Mauss, Hall rightly cites as helping form the background to developments in Marxist structuralism (Hall 1983). Hall documents that Levi-Strauss’s adoption of the distinction between *la langue* and *parole* allows Levi-Strauss to begin to build a “scientific” cultural anthropology. *La langue* is, according to both Saussure and Levi-Strauss, composed of a finite set of relations and rules that exist between signs and defines their relations to one another whereas *parole*, the usage of those signs and relations in individual speech acts is infinite. As Hall notes, once we are able to make this distinction, we are able to take a “scientific approach to something whose essential feature is creativity” and he continues that the importance of this is that studying *la langue* scientifically gives us access to the “collective, unconscious matrix” that defines a given culture’s understandings of itself and its relation to the world (Hall 1983, 62–3). As Hall (1983, 62) argues:

The important feature of the relationship between *parole* and *la langue* is that we can perform the first without knowing the second. We may not know a single rule about the phonetic, grammatical, and semantic relations of language – rules which allow us to produce intelligible speech – but we still do produce intelligible speech all the time. Equally important, we know when somebody has broken the rule, even though we may not know the rule. These rules, for most of us, are internalized at the unconscious level.

Structuralism in Marxism

We can see now how the Marxist structuralism of Althusser and his fellow travelers

can take this – in part – as their starting point in combination with the elements of Marx’s own corpus that emphasizes structural determination in order to build out their reading of Marx in this direction. Hall (1983, 65) is again helpful in arguing that “for Althusser and [Etienne], the mode of production functions like a language.” In “functioning like a language,” the mode of production, for Althusser and his fellow travelers, in all its complexities and richness does the determining of our collective unconscious. It sets the limits of our relations between one another, to the larger social world, and to the natural world. Change happens, but not necessarily because of the free actions of humans as agents, but through a process of repetition and recombination. Keeping some elements of a given structure, leaving out others, and recombining still others.

As is well known, the concept of the “mode of production” in Marxist thinking encompasses both the productive forces (labor power, technologies, raw materials, etc.) and the relations of production (the social and political conditions of production at a given time that include legal and political structures that govern the mode of production, relations between individuals and their work, property rights, etc.). For Althusser (2005) and those labeled “structural Marxists,” the mode of production does the determining of the relations between the economic, the political, the social, and ultimately, the ways individuals understand themselves (Althusser et al. 2009). It functions for these Marxists partially in the same way that the structure of language determines meaning and usage for Saussure, and partially in the same way that Levi-Strauss thinks the structures of myth and kinship are determinative of a culture’s understanding of itself.

However, this reading also makes use of concepts found originally in the psychoanalysis of overdetermination to help make sense of both the complexity and contingency of the ways that the forces and relations of production come together in a given moment in order to produce the concrete historical situation. A thing is overdetermined in that its causes maybe be multiple and so a thing’s existence may not always be the result of the same set of causes. For Althusser (2005, 104–06), particular social formations, contradictions, and ruptures are always overdetermined; they are the result of a complex

of structural determinations in the mode of production combined with the contingency of historical circumstance.

The use of this concept of overdetermination is, in part, also a way of avoiding economic determinism and teleology. Even if the economy determines “in the last instance” as Althusser says, we also have to understand the ways that the economic might be expressed through other means and is articulated in relation to other structures, some of which emerge as a result of other conjunctural historical contingencies and act, themselves, as determiners of other social phenomena (Althusser 2005, 111). Here Althusser argues that though Marx and Engels did not have the concept of overdetermination as a name for it, they also understood that the economic is not the sole force that determines social formations, that it is always structurally intertwined with these other forces. This is what is referred to in Althusser as “structural causality” and we will return to this concept and its importance below.

On such a reading of Marx, one can develop a more scientific understanding of different social formations as formed by different structuralist – and synchronic – combinations of the forces and relations of production that orient the mode of production and those individuals within it in ways that are overdetermined and reproduce and make durable those social formations at given times, and at others, shift and change social formations as the forces and relations of production enter into different combinations at different points in history and the present. In both instances – that of durability and that of shifts and changes – it is the mode of production as it exists at a given time in particular and overdetermined arrangements of the forces and relations of production, that makes possible certain forms of subjectivities and social relations, and make others impossible. This is because the mode of production pre-exists any given individual subjectivity such that individuals are inserted into those structural determinations and thus are subjected to them – or subjectified by them – in their practices, potential ways of being, and consciousness.

Early Marx and Late Marx

For Althusser, and those in his circle, in order to read this kind of structural determination in Marx’s texts, we have to see the

development of his work out of its initial relation to Hegel and his subsequent theoretical break with Hegelianism. There are two main stages in Marx’s own thinking according to Althusser. Influenced by Gaston Bachelard (1984), Althusser argues that there is an earlier and more Hegelian/Feuerbachian stage in which Marx is still beholden to a more agent-centered thinking about the movement of history and society and in which there is a theory of alienation from a foundational human nature as contrasted to a later, more structural, stage in which Marx makes an “epistemological break” from his more agent-centered thinking – thereby fully breaking with his past Hegelian/Feuerbachian roots – to finally begin building his own philosophical and scientific understanding of society.

It is in the earlier stage according to Althusser that we see an emphasis on concepts like alienation from a foundational human nature, and a reconciliation with that nature in the overcoming of capitalism. In these early texts, there is still a definitive “end” or “goal” in history characterized by the alienation-reconciliation process through which humans – and human society – become what they are meant to be. The story of the movement through various forms of society and social organization (from feudalism, to capitalism, and finally beyond capitalism and into communism) is a story of humanity’s slow movement toward its own freedom and dis-alienation. This is an agent-centered story insofar as the protagonists are agents who are alienated from their true human nature in their existence by capital, “alienating” themselves in their labor and their working to transform the world and then viewing themselves in that transformed world in ways that make visible their continued lack of freedom – and ultimately also seeing their connection to one another and so recognizing their class connection and thereby their class power – so as to then work toward remedying that lack in ways that bring about the full and free power of human life. On this narrative, there is a kind of historical teleology to human development which runs through feudalism, into capitalism, and then finally into communism as the overcoming of human alienation.

The second stage in Marx’s thinking is the one wherein Althusser and his fellow travelers think that Marx truly breaks with this more agent-centered, teleological, and

Hegelian thinking and becomes both a fully materialist thinker and also a much better critic of social structures and their role in subjective and social determination. Althusser reads this “break” from Hegel as beginning in the *Theses on Feuerbach* where he argues that Marx recognizes a nascent break with Hegel in Feuerbach’s own work as it is in Feuerbach that we find not the movement of history conditioned by an idea or “spirit” as in Hegel, but rather in humanity’s own self-alienating activity. Althusser reads one place where we can see the beginning of this break in the *Theses on Feuerbach*, and specifically in the sixth thesis, where Marx (2000, 172) writes that in his critique of religion, “Feuerbach resolves the religious essence into the human essence. But the human essence is no abstraction inherent in each individual. In its reality it is the ensemble of social relations.” In Althusser’s reading of this thesis, Marx’s point is that even Feuerbach does not go far enough in criticizing the idea of a human “essence” (which then can be alienated in certain sets of social relations). Instead, we have to see any idea of an “essence” as arising in and out of a given set of social relations (Althusser 2003, 255). Returning to the structuralist conception of the mode of production as that which determines individual consciousness, we can see here one example of the ways that Althusser reads a kind of structuralism back into Marx in positing a break in Marx’s thinking so as to then privilege the ways that larger-than-individual structures that have their existence in the mode of production and are the proper object of study for Marxism. We then also get the privileging of other ways of making the same point as those quoted at the outset of this chapter from *Capital* and *The Eighteenth Brumaire*.

Continued importance of structuralism

We can see here also the importance of the concept of “structural causality” in helping counter Hegelian and humanist readings of Marx. If the mode of production at a given time is the result of an overdetermined set of relations between the forces and relations of production, then there could be no teleology in history such that there could be no reconciliation of an alienated human nature in process. Further, if this is the case, and Marx

himself understood this in his mature work, then we have a method for understanding any given conjuncture: we can look to the mode of production in its complexity at a given time and trace the overdetermined complexity of connections and disconnections between the variety and arraignment of forces and relations of production in order to produce not a theory of the reconciliation of an alienated human subject in the abstract, but rather an understanding of the ways in which individuals and groups are exploited and oppressed in a given place at a given time.

There was – and still is – of course, much debate about the rightness and importance of structuralist readings of Marx like those that emerge in Althusser and his students. And Althusser himself both criticized some of his own work and tried to distance himself and his views from other structuralisms of his times. And some of these debates ended in the view, criticized by Montag that the structuralist Marxism of theorists like Althusser merely represents a moment in time and exist only in relation to the rise of structuralisms in the other fields mentioned above. There are, however, other ongoing currents in Marxism, Marxist theory, and connected post-Marxisms that have taken their leave from Althusser’s structuralist reading of Marx and continue to produce new and important critical theoretical interventions based on this work. The work of Althusser and his fellow travelers continues to influence theoretical and practical work across multiple disciplines from political science, to cultural studies and sociology, philosophy, and global studies (see for instance Silva 2013; Darian-Smith and McCarty, 2017; Sotiris 2020; Rome 2021; Lewis 2021), so we should hardly consider it consigned to the dustbin of history.

GEOFFREY PFEIFER

References

- Althusser, Louis. 2003. *The Humanist Controversy and Other Writings*, translated by G.M. Goshgarian. New York and London: Verso.
- Althusser, Louis. 2005. *For Marx*, translated by Ben Brewster. New York and London: Verso.
- Althusser, Louis and Etienne Balibar. 2009. *Reading Capital*, translated by Ben Brewster. New York and London: Verso.
- Bachelard, Gaston. 1984. *New Scientific Spirit*, translated by Arthur Goldhammer. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Darian-Smith, Eve and Philip McCarty. 2017.

- The Global Turn: Theories, Research Design, and Methods for Global Studies*. Oakland: University of California Press.
- Hall, Stuart. 2016. *Cultural Studies 1983: A Theoretical History*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Lewis, William. 2021. *Concrete Critical Theory: Althusser's Marxism*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. 1975. *Capital Volume One*, translated by Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling. New York: International Publishers.
- Marx, Karl. 2000. *Theses on Feuerbach in Karl Marx: Selected Writings 2nd Edition*, edited by David McLellan. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Marx, Karl. 2000. *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte in Karl Marx: Selected Writings 2nd Edition*, edited by David McLellan. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Montag, Warren. 2013. *Althusser and his Contemporaries: Philosophy's Perpetual War*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Rome, Natalia. 2021. *For Theory: Althusser and the Politics of Time*. New York and London: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Silva, Jennifer. 2013. *Coming up Short: Working Class Adulthood in an Age of Uncertainty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sotiris, Panagiotis. 2020. *A Philosophy for Communism: Rethinking Althusser*. New York and London: Haymarket Books.

15. Structural-functional Marxism

During the early 1960s, structural functionalism had reached its apex as the dominant paradigm in mainstream political sociology and political science. The structural functionalist approach, especially as represented in the “structural analysis” of Talcott Parsons, emphasized a systemic view that explained a social order’s organic unity, natural equilibrium, and tendency toward self-stabilization through the successful generation and distribution of shared values and norms (Schmidt 2005, 100). The popularity of this approach began to decline in that same decade. In particular, Marxist and New Left scholars saw it as having a conservative bias toward systemic stability that implicitly justified the status quo of the Cold War era.

However, in certain respects the dominant influence of structural-functionalism and systems approaches also carried over into Marxism. Louis Althusser’s (Althusser 1965; Althusser et al. 2015) development of a scientific “structural” Marxism from the standpoint of the reproduction of modes of production and the rejection of Marxist humanism, historicism, and empiricism had a major influence on the theoretical developments of the 1960s and 1970s. For critics, Althusser’s contribution represented the grafting of a functionalist approach to Marxist theory (Thompson 1978; Clarke 1980). While never a student of Althusser, Nicos Poulantzas came to be seen as one of the most representative proponents of this Althusserian current in Marxist political theory during the 1970s. This influence is most evident in his first major work, *Pouvoir politique et classes sociales*, published mere months after the May 1968 unrest in Paris (Barrow 2016).

Translated as *Political Power and Social Classes* in 1973, Poulantzas’ systematic exposition of the relative autonomy of the state and its functional role within the capitalist mode of production was a major contribution to the burgeoning interest in Marxist political theory of that time. Bracketing away Poulantzas’ later modifications of his argument, this chapter summarizes his theory of the capitalist state as the cohesive factor of a capitalist social formation. It also discusses

his simultaneous critique of contemporary structural-functionalist sociology and political science, as a way of distinguishing the specifically Marxist dimension of his functionalist approach. Lastly, it concludes by noting some of the contemporary critiques of Poulantzas, mostly predating his shift to a more explicitly relational theory of the state.

The unity and function of the capitalist state

Poulantzas noted that the state posed a general problem for Marxist theory because of the non-systematic and conjunctural treatment of this subject among the “Marxist classics” (Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Gramsci), as well as the economic and reformist approaches in the Second and Third Internationals (Poulantzas 1973, 19–23; 1969). *Political Power* was thus framed as a theoretical intervention building upon Althusser’s groundbreaking works, even as Poulantzas retained important differences from this framework (Barrow 2011; 2016). Poulantzas suggested that the scientific analysis of the capitalist state could not be based in either the inductive and descriptive empiricism characteristic of Anglo-American social science, nor in a Marxist historicism that reduced the political to the question of revolutionary class consciousness, as in Lukács or Korsch. Instead, the capitalist state was a theoretical object of knowledge that needed to be *produced* through the development of scientific concepts that were grounded in the systematic reading of core Marxist texts.

The capitalist mode of production itself made it possible to approach the state as this “autonomous and specific object of science” (Poulantzas 1973, 29). The capitalist mode of production was a specific configuration of the economic, political, and ideological levels or regional instances, which were formally separated and relatively autonomous, even while the economic level remained both the dominant and determinant instance. Poulantzas explained that each of these levels consisted of both structures and class practices or struggles, with the former functionally reproducing the mode of production and the latter potentially dislocating and destabilizing it. Within this complex unity, the general, overarching function of the political level or the state was to constitute and reproduce the

social relations of production, thereby maintaining its overall stability. In Poulantzas' words, the "juridico-political superstructure of the state" has the "particular function of constituting the factor of cohesion between the levels of a social formation" (Poulantzas 1973, 37, 44).

By theorizing the state through the lens of its structures and functions rather than its specific institutions, Poulantzas suggested that the presence and unity of the capitalist state was made known by its effects on the relations of production, on class struggles, and on the reproduction of the capitalist mode of production. The various functions of the state spanned across the political, economic, and ideological levels, such that it acted as the cohesion of the levels of this complex unity as a whole and the regulating factor of that unity's global equilibrium as a system (Poulantzas 1973, 44–5). The institutional power of the state was the node or "point of condensation" where structures and class practices, and the contradictions and displacements between them, were unified, thereby making it the site upon which the unity of the social formation rested (Poulantzas 1973, 42).

What allowed the state to successfully perform this function of managing class conflict and maintaining social cohesion in societies structured by the capitalist mode of production was precisely its *relative autonomy* from the relations of production. This structural feature of the capitalist state became Poulantzas' best known theoretical contribution. Rather than being an instrument used by the capitalist class, the state was the structural location in which the dominant class fractions were organized in light of their long-term *political* class interests. Through a rereading of Marx's *Eighteenth Brumaire*, Poulantzas suggested that this relative autonomy allowed the state to both arrange compromises among the dominant classes vis-à-vis the dominated classes, and to intervene against the economic interests of a particular fraction of the capitalist class in the name of the bourgeoisie's political unity as a whole (Poulantzas 1973, 284–5).

Insofar as the state was more than the aggregate of its particular institutions, but rather an "ensemble of structures" possessing a "specific internal cohesion," its functional purpose was to reproduce class rule on behalf of the capitalist class (Poulantzas 1973, 288,

255). By virtue of its position as the political unity of a given social formation, the state had the capacity to structure the limits within which class struggles would take place. In particular, Poulantzas focused on two ways that the state affected class struggles on the political level. First, it organized the political interests of the dominant class into a power bloc – a "contradictory unity of politically dominant classes and fractions" forged into an "unstable equilibrium of compromise" under the hegemony of a particular class or fraction (Poulantzas 1973, 239, 192). Equally importantly, it deployed both juridical-ideological and repressive mechanisms to *disorganize* the dominated classes on the political level. It accomplished this dual function by "relating itself to the dominated classes as representative of the unity of the people-nation," deploying a juridical "isolation effect" of legal individualization and economic competition, and a representation of those interests through ideological collectivities like popular sovereignty and the nation (Poulantzas 1973, 189). However, this unity always remained the particular political interests of the hegemonic class presented as the general interest of the people-nation *through* the effects of the state.

Poulantzas and contemporary structural-functionalism

One can see the functionalist elements of Poulantzas' state theory – above all, in the claim that the state's presence was felt through its effects of stabilizing and reproducing capitalist class domination across the different levels of a social formation. In making this point, Poulantzas drew upon not just the Marxist classics but also contemporary Anglophone scholarship. In the 1960s, functionalism and systems theory underpinned much of the work on economic development and modernization in political sociology, as well as on the relationship between government and interest groups in political science. To that end, Poulantzas referred to functionalism as the "dominant tendency in the analyses of modern political science" and referenced American social scientists like Gabriel Almond, David Apter, David Easton, Robert Dahl, Karl Deutsch, Talcott Parsons, and Sidney Verba, among others (Poulantzas 1973, 40). These figures were credited with the insights that the polit-

ical indeed served as the factor of maintenance in the unity of a given social formation, as well as with positing the relevant question of the relationship between structures and social interests (Poulantzas 1973, 47). In turn, Easton would later see Poulantzas as having “brought Marxism into some kind of uneasy theoretical accommodation” with a systems perspective (Easton 1981, 320).

Despite this overlap, *Political Power* can be understood precisely as a critique leveled against the theories of power, ideology, and social structure developed within these accounts. For one, the book took as its theoretical object the capitalist state, a concept entirely absent from the functionalist problematic. More importantly, Poulantzas insisted on the regional specificity of the political level, as occupying a particular place within the structural matrix of the capitalist mode of production and social formations. This too was a crucial difference between his position and the functionalism of mid-century political sociology.

Following Althusser, Poulantzas identified an affinity between functionalism and Marxist historicism, which he traced to a common origin in the social theories of Hegel and Weber. The latter, particularly as channeled by both Lukács and Parsons, influenced a historicist theory of society as an expressive totality – a perspective in which the unity of a social formation emanated from a central totalizing instance also present in each of its component parts (Poulantzas 1973, 197). Both the Weberian notion of legitimacy and contemporary functionalism’s interpretation of this concept as the origin and allocation of social values ultimately rested on this historicist problematic, which understood the social totality as the outcome of intentional actions by ends-oriented subjects (individuals, status groups, and social classes).

As a result, neither Marxist historicism nor American functionalism could theoretically ground the distinct structural location of the political level in a social formation. Instead, the distinctiveness of the political was reduced to “the simple principle of social totality and the principle of its development” (Poulantzas 1973, 40). Functionalist accounts thus turned the basic question of the role played by the political in generating social unity and stability into the study of the legitimization of the relations of an integrated and equilibrated social system (Poulantzas 1973,

198, 221). Rather than having this structural location occupied by the state, the political – now theorized through the lens of social norms and values – was diffused throughout an integrated and homologous social whole.

Poulantzas further elaborated this critique of functionalism in a later essay, where he rejected the “bourgeois-sociological” idea that political crisis represented a “dysfunctional moment that ruptures an otherwise harmonious functioning of the ‘system’” until a new equilibrium was reached (Poulantzas 2008, 295). The functionalist view overlooked the inherent role of class contradictions and struggles within the reproduction of the capitalist mode of production, especially in its monopoly phase, and within the capitalist state. It presented class struggles and socio-political conflicts as conflicts over values and legitimization, and by portraying crises as accidental interruptions to an otherwise normally functioning and self-regulating system. This framing of dysfunction and equilibrium overlooked the constitutive role of both class struggles and political crisis as inherent features of monopoly capitalism and of the reproduction of the state’s institutionalized political power as a unitary whole.

The legacy of Marxist structural-functionalism

Poulantzas’ (1969) review of Ralph Miliband’s *The State in Capitalist Society* and the English appearance of *Political Power* in 1973 led to a rapid uptake of his account as representative of a “structuralist” position distinct from both the power elite framework of C. Wright Mills and the alleged Marxist “instrumentalism” of Miliband (Gold, Lo, and Wright 1975; Aronowitz and Bratsis 2002; Barrow 2008; Jessop 2008; Barrow 2016). However, while acknowledging its theoretical sophistication, contemporary readers also criticized Poulantzas’ account for its abstraction and formalism, ahistoricism, and an excessive focus on political power at the expense of class struggles and the process of capital accumulation (Miliband 1970; 1973; Bridges 1974; Gold, Lo, and Wright 1975; Block 1977; Clarke 1977; Holloway and Picciotto 1978; Skocpol 1980; Jessop 1985; Das 1996).

In his two contributions to their debate, Miliband (1970; 1973) termed Poulantzas’ work as “structural super-determinism” and

“structuralist abstractionism.” For Miliband, Poulantzas’ exclusive stress on objective relations, theorized through structures and levels rather than through historical and empirical investigations, had actually undercut his argument for relative autonomy by merely replacing the concrete actors of the ruling class with a more structural dependence of the state on class power. Conversely, Jessop (1985, 53–4) has suggested that Poulantzas’ work suffered from the opposite problem: an overly politicist account of the state that downplayed the economic apparatuses and functions of the capitalist state. This relative neglect of the economic stemmed from Poulantzas’ theoretical separation of the economic and the political levels, and his tasking the latter with the responsibility for maintaining the unity of a social formation.

Poulantzas had been critical in *Political Power* of the schematic way that Althusser and especially Balibar had theorized the levels of a social formation (Poulantzas 1973, 87–9; Barrow 2016, 111–13). However, the Althusserian premise of the relative autonomy of the political and economic in the capitalist mode of production was also challenged by the German state derivationist or capital logic school (Holloway and Picciotto 1978), as well as by Simon Clarke (1977). For both, Poulantzas’ analysis of the political level as an autonomous and specific object of science merely reproduced the fragmentation of bourgeois society into nominally independent spheres. Without a systematic analysis of the capitalist state and the processes of class struggle and capital accumulation understood as a social totality, Poulantzas was said to have missed how the state both served and was constrained by the contradictions inherent to the realization of surplus value (Holloway and Picciotto 1978, 7). Moreover, for Clarke (1977), Poulantzas’ reliance on a technicist understanding of the economic and a functionalist understanding of class struggle had merely reproduced the errors of structural-functionalist sociology in the terminology of Althusserian Marxism.

By the late 1970s, the reception of Poulantzas’ arguments within U.S. political sociology and political science had led to the emergence of neo-statist or institutionalist critiques (Block 1977; Skocpol 1980). Pushing beyond the formalism of *Political Power*, these authors retained the emphasis on the structural constraints faced by social

actors and state institutions; however, they also suggested that the convergence between capitalist class interests and state power was far more historically variable than Poulantzas allowed. Thus, for Skocpol, while Poulantzas’ theory could predict the functional outcomes of state policies and interventions, it both overestimated the regularity with which capitalist states would perform these functions and underestimated how struggles from below could affect the alignment of capitalist class interests and state policy (Skocpol 1980, 172, 178). In a somewhat related vein, Block (1977) saw capitalist state policies as the outcome of a three-sided relationship between capitalist class interests, working class struggles, and state managers. Facing competing constraints from capital and labor, state managers possessed coordinated state policies in the interests of long-term social unity.

In the Anglophone world, these and other critiques, coupled with the delay in the translation of *Political Power* and the waning interest in Marxist theories of the state after the 1980s, had largely frozen in time the reading of Poulantzas as a Marxist functionalist. It is only within the past decade that new attempts have been made to resituate Poulantzas’ earlier positions within the broader political and strategic debates of his time, and to develop their implications for the present (Gallas et al. 2011; Jessop 2016; Sotiris 2017; Kalampokas, Betzelos, and Sotiris 2018; Sotiris and Goes 2018; Ducange and Keucheyan 2019; Gorriti 2020).

RAFAEL KHACHATURIAN

References

- Althusser, Louis. 1965. *For Marx*. London: Verso.
- Althusser, Louis, Etienne Balibar, Roger Establet, Pierre Macherey, and Jacques Ranciere. 2015. *Reading Capital*. London: Verso.
- Aronowitz, Stanley, and Peter Bratsis, eds. 2002. *Paradigm Lost: State Theory Reconsidered*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 2008. “Ralph Miliband and the Instrumentalist Theory of the State: The (Mis) Construction of an Analytic Concept.” In *Class, Power and the State in Capitalist Society*, edited by Paul Wetherly, Clyde W. Barrow, and Peter Burnham, 84–108. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 2011. “(Re)Reading Poulantzas: State Theory and the Epistemologies of Structuralism.” In *Reading Poulantzas*,

- edited by Alexander Gallas, Lars Brethauer, John Kannankulam, and Ingo Stützle, 27–40. Pontypool: Merlin Press.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 2016. *Toward a Critical Theory of States: The Poulantzas-Miliband Debate after Globalization*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Block, Fred. 1977. “The Ruling Class Does Not Rule: Notes on the Marxist Theory of the State.” *Socialist Revolution*, 33, 6–28.
- Bridges, Amy Beth. 1974. “Nicos Poulantzas and the Marxist Theory of the State.” *Politics & Society*, 4, no. 2, 161–90.
- Clarke, Simon. 1977. “Marxism, Sociology and Poulantzas’ Theory of the State.” *Capital & Class*, 1, no. 2, 1–31.
- Clarke, Simon. 1980. “Althusserian Marxism.” In *One-Dimensional Marxism: Althusser and the Politics of Culture*, 7–102. London: Allison & Busby.
- Das, Raju J. 1996. “State Theories: A Critical Analysis.” *Science & Society*, 60, no. 1, 27–57.
- Ducange, Jean-Numa, and Razmig Keucheyan, eds. 2019. *The End of the Democratic State: Nicos Poulantzas, a Marxism for the 21st Century*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Easton, David. 1981. “The Political System Besieged by the State.” *Political Theory*, 9, no. 3, 303–25.
- Gallas, Alexander, Lars Brethauer, John Kannankulam, and Ingo Stützle, eds. 2011. *Reading Poulantzas*. Merlin Press.
- Gold, David A., Clarence Y. H. Lo, and Erik Olin Wright. 1975. “Recent Developments in Marxist Theories of the Capitalist State, Part I.” *Monthly Review*, 27, no. 5, 29–51.
- Gorriti, Jacinta. 2020. *Nicos Poulantzas. Una Teoría Materialista Del Estado*. Santiago de Chile: Doble Ciencia.
- Holloway, John, and Sol Picciotto, eds. 1978. “Introduction: Towards a Materialist Theory of the State.” In *State and Capital: A Marxist Debate*, 1–31. London: Edward Arnold.
- Jessop, Bob. 1985. *Nicos Poulantzas: Marxist Theory and Political Strategy*. New York: St. Martin’s Press.
- Jessop, Bob. 2008. “Dialogue of the Deaf: Some Reflections on the Poulantzas-Miliband Debate.” In *Class, Power and the State in Capitalist Society: Essays on Ralph Miliband*, edited by Paul Wetherly, Clyde W. Barrow, and Peter Burnham, 132–57. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jessop, Bob. 2016. *The State: Past, Present, Future*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Kalampokas, Giorgos, Tassos Betzelos, and Panagiotis Sotiris. 2018. “State, Political Power and Revolution: Althusser, Poulantzas, Balibar and the ‘Debate on the State.’” *Décalages*, 2 no. 2, 1–31.
- Miliband, Ralph. 1970. “The Capitalist State—Reply to N. Poulantzas.” *New Left Review*, 59, 53–60.
- Miliband, Ralph. 1973. “Poulantzas and the Capitalist State.” *New Left Review*, 82, 83–92.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. 1969. “The Problem of the Capitalist State.” *New Left Review*, 58, 67–78.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. 1973. *Political Power and Social Classes*. London: New Left Books.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. 2008. “The Political Crisis and the Crisis of the State.” In *The Poulantzas Reader*, edited by James Martin, 294–322. London: Verso.
- Schmidt, Vivien. 2005. “Institutionalism.” In *The State: Theories and Issues*, edited by Colin Hay, Michael Lister, and David Mars, 98–117. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Skocpol, Theda. 1980. “Political Response to Capitalist Crisis: Neo-Marxist Theories of the State and the Case of the New Deal.” *Politics & Society* 10, no. 2, 155–201.
- Sotiris, Panagiotis. 2017. “Althusser and Poulantzas: Hegemony and the State.” *Historical Materialism*. 2017. www.historicalmaterialism.org/blog/althusser-and-poulantzas-hegemony-and-state, accessed October 5, 2023.
- Sotiris, Panagiotis, and Thomas Goes. 2018. “Poulantzas Revisited: State, Classes and Socialist Transition; An Interview with Panagiotis Sotiris.” *Viewpoint Magazine*. May 7, 2018. www.viewpointmag.com/2018/05/07/poulantzas-revisited-state-classes-and-socialist-transition-an-interview-with-panagiotis-sotiris/, accessed October 5, 2023.
- Thompson, E.P. 1978. *The Poverty of Theory and Other Essays*. New York: NYU Press.

See also

Structural Marxism; Institutional Marxism; Marxist Theory of the State; Poulantzas, Nicos; Miliband, Ralph; New Left Review; Barrow, Clyde W.; Jessop, Bob.

16. Systems-analytic Marxism

The politics of advanced capitalist societies have been increasingly destabilized during the last five decades by a cumulative series of economic, political, and cultural crises (O'Connor 1978, 1984, 1987; Crozier et al. 1975; Habermas 1975; Bell 1976). These crises have led a growing number of Marxist and Post-Marxist theorists to suggest that systematic limitations on state policy are being encountered due to emerging contradictions in the capital accumulation process. Hence, it can no longer be assumed that capitalist states will succeed in maintaining the capital accumulation process or in resolving the crises generated by that process. Hence, unlike earlier approaches to the theory of the state, such as instrumentalism or structuralism, the theoretical objective of Marxian systems analysis is to develop a theory of the capitalist state that can identify the limits of the state's policy making capacities (Barrow 1993, Chap. 4). In a key departure from orthodox Marxist and Neo-Marxist theory, systems analysis seeks to conceptualize, anticipate, and explain the crisis tendencies of capitalist societies instead of focusing on its maintenance and stabilization mechanisms.

Methodology of systems analysis

In systems analysis, the capitalist mode of production is conceptualized as a system composed of three interdependent but relatively autonomous subsystems: the economic subsystem, the political subsystem, and the socialization subsystem. The most important institutions associated with the economic subsystem are the relations of production between classes in the workplace (private property) and relations of exchange between buyers and sellers in the marketplace (contract). The socialization subsystem, from which individuals derive normative values, includes the family, educational institutions, religion, and culture. Finally, in contemporary capitalism, the political subsystem consists primarily of those institutions and policies that constitute the state and the state apparatus.

Importantly, though each subsystem encompasses concretely identifiable institu-

tions, the capitalist system is posited as an ontological entity – real in itself – which produces consequences through the structured relations between institutions and which is therefore never reducible to institutions. Claus Offe (1984, 37) maintains that the capitalist system is a “superordinate level of mechanisms that generate ‘events’.” However, the superordinate reality of this system is only observable empirically when the mechanisms that fulfill a maintenance function fail to suppress the underlying contradictions of the capitalist mode of production. A contradiction, according to Offe (1984, 132) “is the tendency inherent within a specific mode of production to destroy those very pre-conditions on which its survival depends.” Consequently, the historical development of a contradiction must inevitably culminate in a crisis event that makes the contradiction perceptible as policy failure.

Therefore, in a systems-analytic approach to the state, the methodological point of departure is not “the forms, procedures, rules and instruments of state activity [i.e., institutions],” but “hypothetical notions about the functional connection between state activity and the structural problems of a (capitalist) social formation” (Offe 1984, 88–9, 100). The objective in studying state activity is to explain state policies by analytic reference to their substantive maintenance functions. Yet, taking that approach a step further, Post-Marxist systems-analysis aims to understand the increasing failure of state activities in terms of the developing contradictions within the capitalist system (Offe 1985).

Systemic power and the labor market

According to Jürgen Habermas (1970), the relative dominance of the economic subsystem in capitalism is what generates the contradictory dynamics of development within the overall system. Offe locates this dynamic in the structure of capitalist labor markets where the exchange of commodities between equals (labor-power for wages) must coexist with an unequal distribution of property (relations of production). Offe (1985, 12) emphasizes that capitalist labor markets can exist only to the extent that workers are propertyless in two senses: “Labor can neither be the property of another nor possess property.”

In the first instance, labor markets are possible only to the extent that labor is free and mobile and, thus, available for sale on the market in exchange for wages. Yet, as Offe also observes, the rise of a market in labor-power is not necessarily the pre-ordained outcome of liberating labor from pre-capitalist forms of bondage such as serfdom or slavery. A second and more coercive condition for the existence of labor markets is that workers cannot own property, and thus cannot control their own chances of securing an existence outside of the labor market. Wages offer the inducement, but propertylessness makes it necessary, for free workers to enter the labor market. These conditions are created and enforced by the state through law.

This asymmetrical structure of the capitalist labor market establishes an unequal bargaining position between laborers and capitalists. Quite simply, capitalists are always in a position to out-wait workers and to strike a more favorable bargain in the negotiation of wage contracts because they own the means of production. In this respect, labor markets constitute “the most significant feature of capitalist social structures” because they are the “power-generating mode of interaction that leads to a relatively stable and consistent matrix of social power” within the capitalist system (Offe 1985, 2).

However, Offe contends that an economic subsystem organized by the labor market is continually threatened by potential disintegration to the extent that labor-power is not really a commodity. Labor-power is a fictive commodity (Polanyi 1949, 75–6) in the sense that one cannot physically separate it from the laborer nor, therefore, unequivocally transfer rights to it in the process of exchange. Labor-power and the laborer are inseparable. As a result, any extended reproduction of the economic subsystem requires the uninterrupted support of a socialization subsystem (ideology) and the persistent intervention of the political subsystem (repression). A labor market can operate smoothly only to the extent that socialization mechanisms sustain a normative structure in which it is legitimate to view labor-power as if it was a commodity and where workers orient themselves to a condition of wage-slavery as if it were a condition of freedom. The labor market itself does not provide such mechanisms internally but instead generates class

conflict between the workers who own their labor-power and the capitalists who own the means of production.

Therefore, as class conflict increases, the political subsystem must increasingly support the socialization subsystem and supply the coercion and inducements necessary to maintain the asymmetry of labor market exchanges. Offe emphasizes that the state must actively intervene in the economy and society both to initially constitute and to subsequently maintain labor markets. Offe refers to these interventions as social policy. The operational objective of social policy is to establish “a state strategy for incorporating labor power into the wage labor relation” (Offe 1984, 98, 92). By contributing to the constitution of the working class, particular configurations of social policy (i.e., state forms) make the appropriation of surplus value possible at each stage of capitalist development.

State social policy can fulfill a maintenance function in various ways at different stages of capitalist development. It can, for example, remove traditional protections that buffer the coercive powers of the labor market. The state can utilize its coercive apparatus to directly force workers back into the labor market by breaking strikes or using troops to carry out emergency nationalizations. On the other hand, particularly with the rise of political democracy, state social policy has utilized inducements designed to increase the rewards (e.g., social security) and reduce the risks (e.g., workmen’s compensation) of labor market participation, and to adopt policies that facilitate the extended reproduction of labor-power through state subsidies (e.g., child allowances, public education, universal health care, public housing). These social policy inducements are the empirical reference for Offe’s concept of the welfare state.

Contradictions of the welfare state

The methodological criterion for conceptualizing what is “capitalist” about the modern welfare state is to specify the ways in which the state is functionally related to and dependent upon the capital accumulation process. At a general level, the methodological strategy of systems analysis differs little from that of the structural-functionalists. However, Offe has specified this functional relation in terms of four analytic principles: the principles

of exclusion, maintenance, dependency, and legitimation.

The principle of exclusion refers to the separation of property ownership and political authority in capitalist systems. The private ownership of property in capitalist systems requires that economic decisions be made exclusively by those who own or directly manage productive assets. The separation of economic decision-making from political authority means that "the state has no authority to order production or to control it" (Offe 1975, 126). The functional result is the state cannot command economic performance; the state can only induce investment and employment by offering incentives to those who control productive assets (Elkin 1987, 18). To adopt social policies that exceed this "systemic boundary" would entail a type of state that by definition is non-capitalist. In this sense, the principle of exclusion functions as a selective mechanism at the system level to screen out social policies that are incompatible with the private ownership of the means of production.

However, the principle of exclusion merely entails the rejection of policies that are functionally incompatible with the structural foundations of the capitalist system. Consequently, Offe insists that a maintenance principle must also operate to ensure that capitalist states do not only have the authority, but the mandate to create and sustain inducements to private capital accumulation. This mandate can be realized consistently only if further selective mechanisms function within the state apparatus to systematically produce the required social policies. First, to fulfill its maintenance function, coordinative mechanisms within the state apparatus must ensure that state policies possess the requisite rationality, that is, that state policies will in fact induce optimum levels of investment and employment. State personnel must be able to recognize and select the general interests of the capitalist class amid the competition of special interests. Likewise, the state apparatus must have the administrative capacities to implement and administer maintenance policies. Second, repressive mechanisms within the state apparatus must function simultaneously to filter out any non-capitalist policies which have not effectively been negated at the system level (Offe 1974).

However, by themselves, the exclusion and maintenance principles do not explain why

the state must promote private accumulation or how state policies are prevented from going beyond the boundary constraints of a *capitalist* system. The operation of these two constraints is functionally linked to the dependency principle. The dependency principle is that the decision-making power and policy capabilities of the state are always dependent upon the success and continuity of the accumulation process. This is most immediately evident in the state's dependence on its capacity to raise tax revenues. The modern state's dependence on tax revenues means that every interest which the state and state personnel may have in their own stability and development can only be pursued if it is in accordance with the imperative of maintaining accumulation. Moreover, as Offe (1984, 126) observes: "this fundamental dependency upon accumulation also functions as a selective principle upon state policies" for to violate the logic of accumulation would simultaneously weaken or undermine all state capacities. Thus, a concern for the continuity of private accumulation is "incorporated in the pursuit of interests and policies that, considered by themselves, may have little or nothing to do with accumulation" (Offe 1984, 126).

Finally, in a political democracy, the capitalist state must also establish its legitimacy with the population governed within its territorial jurisdiction. A capitalist state which sustains an exploitative accumulation process can only achieve legitimacy by deploying concealment and ideological mechanisms. Concealment mechanisms, such as administrative secrecy, facilitate the adoption and implementation of maintenance policies outside the sphere of class struggle and special interest competition. The state's ideological mechanisms convey the image that its power is organized to pursue the general interests of society even though it functions in a specific relationship to capitalist accumulation. Consequently, a capitalist state must sustain and yet conceal a structural disjuncture between its democratic form and its capitalist functions (Edelman 1976).

The capitalist state must respond to contradictions in the capitalist mode of production with social policies that are compatible with these four principles and are, therefore, sufficiently rational to maintain private capital accumulation. The question, however, is whether the state can do so without violating

the logic of its own system boundary constraints. The dilemma is that the state must protect the capital-wage-labor relation "from the social conditions it produces without being able to alter the status of this relationship as the dominant relationship" in capitalist society (Offe 1984, 49). Thus, a number of political contradictions accompanied the development of the welfare state during the post-World War II era.

The initial dynamic of these contradictions resides in the maintenance principle. In effecting the state's role as the "ideal collective capitalist," state policies must in principle represent the interests of the capitalist class as a whole. However, precisely because "'capital as a whole' exists only in an ideal sense, i.e., it is incapable of formulating and articulating a common class interest, it requires special guidance and supervision by a fully differentiated political-administrative system" (Offe 1984, 49). In other words, to execute the maintenance principle, the state is systematically compelled to violate the exclusion principle.

On this point, Offe's (1973) systems-analysis explicitly accepts Elmer Altwater's (1973a, 1973b) thesis that individual capitalists cannot themselves produce the general political and material conditions necessary for profitable business activities. Thus, maintaining the capital accumulation process requires the state to first articulate and then enforce the general interests of the capitalist class against the narrow and empirically divergent interests of individual capitalists. Second, the ability to execute these general interests through social policy requires that a certain amount of surplus value (taxes) be allocated for the maintenance of the state and state personnel. Taxes are an appropriation of value that is no longer available for capital investment or for private distribution as profits, interests, or rent. Consequently, on both fronts, individual capitalists confront the state as a source of constant annoyance that it views as parasitic, wasteful, and expropriative in its interventions.

Over time, and as a result of persistent crises, capitalism's maintenance as a system requires greater and greater state intervention in the economic and socialization subsystems. The tendency for the rate of profit to fall requires the state to socialize more and more of the costs of production, while the attendant increases in class struggle require

the development of an ever more extensive ideological state apparatus. When maintenance policies of this type are executed to their fullest extent such interventions establish a technocratic strategy for managing crises. However, the state's ability to pursue a technocratic (authoritarian) strategy is systematically obstructed because: (a) it violates the exclusion principle and, (b) to intervene directly on behalf of capital would violate the legitimization principle (i.e., the state's democratic form). The latter boundary violation sets in motion an internal contradiction between the democratic form and capitalist functions of the state.

On the other hand, the state can neither rely on, nor create, a democratic strategy for transcending the exclusion principle by reconstituting the economic subsystem (e.g., as economic democracy). Mobilizing the latter option would violate the maintenance principle. For example, the state is prevented from significantly increasing revenues either by nationalizing productive activities or by introducing a highly progressive tax system. Either option would produce a decline in business confidence and, hence, trigger an investment strike. An investment strike, as the structuralists demonstrated, invokes the dependency principle (because of declining state revenues) which then realigns the functioning of the state with capital. To counter declining private investment, the state must then offer new inducements and incentives to private investors.

However, an important feature distinguishing systems analysis from similar structuralist analyses is the realization that welfare states actually fail to function at precisely those moments when most needed and that these system failures result in genuinely contradictory outcomes. On the one hand, the welfare state's financial capacity to provide social insurance is dependent on the level of employment and income (e.g., social security and unemployment taxes). The higher the rates of employment and income, the greater the welfare state's capacity to deliver income supports that are needed by fewer and fewer people. Yet, the volume of the welfare state's social insurance demands is determined by the amount of income and employment needs that remain unsatisfied by the labor market either because of unemployment or low wages. Consequently, the more the welfare state is needed due to the shrinking employ-

ment opportunities offered by the economy, the less capable the welfare state becomes of satisfying these needs.

Furthermore, as state policy is increasingly buffeted between fulfilling the contradictory requirements of accumulation and legitimation, there is a twofold impact throughout the capitalist system. First, state policies become opportunistic and nonstrategic short-term responses that are neither predictable nor coherent in their objectives. The result is a political subsystem which increasingly operates at a sub-optimal level in fulfilling both its maintenance and legitimation functions. Moreover, these sub-optimal policy outputs feed back into the socialization and economic subsystems as suboptimal policy inputs. Consequently, these subsystems generate cumulatively less and less normative loyalty and economic growth to legitimate the political system. The cumulative impact of sub-optimal social policy is that organized capitalism is steadily disorganized by the very subsystem most responsible for maintaining the system's functional integration. A second impact is that the organization of the state apparatus is torn between the contradictory imperatives of legitimation (i.e., political democracy) and accumulation (i.e., technocracy). As a result, the state apparatus also steadily disintegrates into uncoordinated policy networks working at cross purposes.

Systems analysis as a critique of political science

Critical systems analysis differs from mainstream systems analysis (Easton 1953, 1965) and structural functionalism (1957) in four ways. First, mainstream systems analysis and structural functionalism conceptualize systems at a highly abstract level because they aspire to identify systemic relationships and behavioral patterns that are applicable to all systems. Mainstream systems analysis and structural functionalism are oriented toward the construction of a *general theory* of social systems. Critical systems analysis conceptualizes the system at a concrete level and thus identifies a specifically *capitalist* system that develops according to its own historical dynamic.

Mainstream systems analysis conceptualizes social formations as a collection of

parallel but independent systems – political, economic, cultural, ecological – that each operate and develop according to their own internal and autonomous sets of rules. There are clear boundaries between these autonomous systems and therefore they have only an *exogenous* relation to each other. Each system functions independently of the other systems and they only come into relation with each other through external shocks (crisis events) that occasionally ripple into adjacent systems and temporarily disrupt the equilibrium of the overall social system. In contrast, critical systems analysis conceptualizes these systems as sub-systems of a single capitalist system, which therefore have an *endogenous* relation to each other; they are necessarily related to each other in the extended reproduction and maintenance of the capitalist system.

Furthermore, mainstream systems analysis views each system as co-equal with the other systems. In contrast, critical systems analysis grants primacy to the economic sub-system and it is this sub-system that provides the dynamic element in critical systems analysis. The economic sub-system in capitalism is not a static system tending toward general equilibrium, but a dynamic system that is constantly undergoing change and development because the class struggle and the profit imperative generate continuous innovations in the forces of production (Marx and Engels 1976) that perpetually destabilize the system's relations of production.

Finally, mainstream systems analysis posits that all systems tend toward equilibrium and disequilibrium is the result of sporadic and unpredictable external shocks that cause one system's outputs to destabilize other systems which incorporate those disturbances as systems inputs. Critical systems analysis argues that the capitalist system inherently tends toward disequilibrating crises and this tendency originates in the economic subsystem. Thus, the state (political subsystem) necessarily comes to play an increasingly important role in maintaining the equilibrium of the capitalist system, but it is posited that the contradictions of capitalism will at some point result in a systemic crisis that cannot be resolved within the boundaries of the capitalist system.

CLYDE W. BARROW

References

- Altwater, Elmer. 1973a. "Notes on Some Problems of State Interventionism (I)." *Kapitalistate*, 1, 97–108.
- Altwater, Elmer. 1973b. "Notes on Some Problems of State Interventionism (II)." *Kapitalistate*, 2, 76–83.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 1993. *Critical Theories of the State: Marxist, Neo-Marxist, Post-Marxist*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Bell, Daniel. 1976. *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*. New York: Basic Books.
- Crozier, Michel J., Samuel P. Huntington, and Joji Watanuki, eds. 1975. *The Crisis of Democracy*. New York: New York University Press.
- Easton, David. 1953. *The Political System: An Inquiry into the State of Political Science*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Easton, David. 1965. *A Systems Analysis of Political Life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Edelman, Murray. 1976. *The Symbolic Use of Politics*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Elkin, Stephen L. 1987. *City and Regime in the American Republic*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1975. *Legitimation Crisis*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1970. *Toward a Rational Society*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. 1976 [1848]. "The Communist Manifesto." In *Marx-Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 6, 477–519. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Marx, Karl. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, Vol. 1. Translated by Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co., 1906.
- Merton, Robert K. 1957. *Social Theory and Social Structure*, Revised and Enlarged Edition. New York: The Free Press.
- O'Connor, James. 1978. *The Fiscal Crisis of the State*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- O'Connor, James. 1984. *Accumulation Crisis*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- O'Connor, James. 1987. *The Meaning of Crisis: A Theoretical Introduction*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Offe, Claus. 1973. "The Abolition of Market Control and the Problem of Legitimacy (I)." *Kapitalistate*, 1, 109–16.
- Offe, Claus. 1973. "The Abolition of Market Control and the Problem of Legitimacy (II)." *Kapitalistate*, 2, 73–5.
- Offe, Claus. 1974. "Structural Problems of the Capitalist State: Class Rule and the Political System. On the Selectiveness of Political Institutions." In *German Political Studies*, Vol. 1, edited by Klaus von Beyme, 31–57. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Offe, Claus. 1975. "The Theory of the Capitalist State and the Problem of Policy Formation." In *Stress and Contradiction in Modern Capitalism*, edited by Leon Lindberg, 125–44. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Offe, Claus. 1984. *Contradictions of the Welfare State*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.
- Offe, Claus. 1985. *Disorganized Capitalism*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.
- Parsons, Talcott. 1951. *The Social System*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Polanyi, Karl. 1944. *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Section II: Theories of the State

17. What is the state?

Every human community has some type of political organization that governs and regulates the behavior of its individual members. The state is best defined in terms of its basic structural characteristics, which are territoriality, sovereignty, law, centralization, legitimation, and class stratification (Nelson 2006, 7–9). A key characteristic of the state is that in contrast to earlier forms of political organization, such as gens, clans, and tribes, which are based on lineage and heredity (Service 1975; Llewellyn 1983), the state is a form of political organization based on territorial jurisdiction (Engels 1972). Thus, Max Weber (1946, 78, 82–3) defines the state as “a human community that (successfully) claims the *monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force* within a given territory.”

A state’s sovereignty depends on its ability to successfully enforce a monopoly of physical force in relation to all inhabitants of its territory, against the claims of neighboring states, and against the claims of competing forms of political organization (e.g., tribes) within the same territory. Thus, for a state to exist and persist, it must centralize the coercive powers of law, administration, and military force, because sovereignty does not exist when governmental authority is retained by competing social units or where a territory’s inhabitants remain loyal to other forms of governance that operate independently of the state’s central authority. Consequently, “state-building” has always been a lengthy and violent historical process involving the subordination of competing forms of political organization to the state’s sovereign authority and securing of its territorial boundaries against rival states (Tilly 1975). The state exercises its sovereignty through the application of general laws that are considered authoritatively binding on all inhabitants within the state’s claimed territory.

The state’s structural characteristics of territoriality, sovereignty, and centralized government (law) are always reinforced by a corresponding form of state consciousness or an ideology of legitimation. The legitimacy of a state nearly always derives from an operative myth of the state’s origin or foundation, such as a belief that the law is received from the gods, or that the state was founded by heroes with exceptional virtues

and wisdom, or that the state was established by contract among its citizens. Yet, as a matter of fact, all states arise from a system of class stratification, which is reproduced by the state as one of its main political and economic functions. Class is not the only kind of social stratification that exists in state level societies, because it generally co-exists with gender, racial, or ethnic forms of stratification, but class stratification is a unique attribute of state forms of governance (Engels 1972).

While mainstream political scientists have focused on the formal-legal and organizational aspects of the state, critical political scientists – and especially Marxist state theorists – have focused on the state’s role in reproducing different modes of production based on specific forms of class stratification and economic exploitation. In Volume 3 of *Capital*, Marx (1998, 382) observes that states perform “common activities arising from the nature of all communities, and the specific functions arising from the antithesis between the government and the mass of the people.” This means that all states perform a coordinating role that Nicos Poulantzas (1978, 44–5, 47 fn. 17) identifies as the general maintenance function of the state. Poulantzas also identifies the general function as a “repressive function” common to all states and, therefore, requiring a repressive state apparatus (i.e., police, courts, prisons, surveillance, military). Moreover, to secure voluntary compliance or acquiescence from inhabitants under normal circumstances the state requires an ideological apparatus (e.g., church, schools, ceremonies, symbols), which led Louis Althusser (1971) to argue that The State = Repression + Ideology. The repressive and ideological functions of the state ensure the economic and social dominance of the ruling class simply by maintaining social stability and thereby ensures the extended reproduction of the mode of production in which that ruling class is dominant.

Ralph Miliband (1969, 49) argues that in contemporary capitalism the state has evolved such complexity that the state should now be understood as an analytic reference point that “stands for ... a number of particular institutions which, together, constitute its reality, and which interact as parts of what may be called the state system.” For Miliband (1969, 49–53), the state system in contemporary capitalism is composed of five elements that

are each identified with a cluster of political institutions:

1. the governmental apparatus which consists of elected legislative and executive authorities at the national level, which make state policy,
2. the administrative apparatus, consisting of the civil service bureaucracy, public corporations, central banks, regulatory commissions, which regulate economic, social, cultural, and other activities,
3. the coercive apparatus, consisting of the military, paramilitary, police, and intelligence agencies, which together are concerned with the deployment and management of violence,
4. the judicial apparatus, which includes courts, the legal profession, jails and prisons, and other components of the criminal justice system,
5. the sub-central governments, such as States, Provinces, or Departments; counties, municipal governments, and special districts.

Poulantzas emphasizes that the various components of the state apparatus are always arranged in hierarchical relations of domination and subordination and this specific arrangement defines specific state forms. He argues that one of the major shifts within the contemporary state apparatus is the emergence of a new state economic apparatus. This apparatus includes central banks, treasuries, and trade offices, which coordinate their activities with new supra-national entities, such as the World Trade Organization, European Commission, Group of 7, and International Monetary Fund, but they also coordinate directly with transnational capitalists (e.g., transnational corporations and global investment banks). Poulantzas (1980, 167) claims that whereas the repressive and ideological state apparatuses were predominant in earlier forms of the capitalist state, the “economic functions henceforth occupy the dominant place within the State.”

CLYDE W. BARROW

References

- Althusser, Louis. 1971. “Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses: Notes Towards an Investigation.” In *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, 127–86. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Engels, Friedrich. 1972. *The Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State*. New York: International Publishers.
- Llewellyn, Ted C. 1983. *Political Anthropology: An Introduction*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey.
- Marx, Karl. 1998 [1894]. “Capital: A Critique of Political Economy, Vol. 3: The Process of Capitalist Production as a Whole” in *Marx-Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 37. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Miliband, Ralph. 1969. *The State in Capitalist Society*. New York: Basic Books.
- Moore, Jr., Barrington. 1966. *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Nelson, Brian R. 2006. *The Making of the Modern State: A Theoretical Evolution*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Panitch, Leo, ed. 1977. *The Canadian State: Political Economy and Political Power*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. 1978. *Political Power and Social Classes*. London: Verso.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. 1980. *State, Power, Socialism*. London: Verso.
- Skocpol, Theda. 1979. *States and Social Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Skocpol, Theda. 1980. “Political Response to Capitalist Crisis: Neo-Marxist Theories of the State and the Case of the New Deal.” *Politics and Society* 10: 155–201.
- Tilly, Charles, ed. 1975. *The Formation of National States in Western Europe*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Weber, Max. 1946. “Politics as a Vocation.” In *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, edited by Hans H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, 77–128. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

See also

- Marxist Theory of the State I and II; Ralph Miliband; Nicos Poulantzas; Leo Panitch; Clyde W. Barrow

18. Marxist theories of the state I

The state has been a controversial topic within the history of Marxist political and legal thought. In part, this is due to the fragmentary character of Marx's writing on the subject. In Marx's (1973, 108) notebooks from the late 1850s, posthumously published as the *Grundrisse*, he indicated that "the concentration of bourgeois society in the form of the state" would be part of the broader, systematic critique of political economy he was pursuing at the time. However, only the first volume of *Capital* was published in his lifetime, which left this ambitious project incomplete. Later commentators have thus faced the challenge of recomposing his scattered writings on the subject spanning from the 1840s to the 1880s into a more coherent and systematic theory.

A further problem with the claim that there is a single Marxist theory of the state is that for both Marx and those who came after, this concept was deeply entwined with contemporary political questions. Discussions of the state within the history of Marxism were embedded in specific disputes about the strategies that working class movements and parties should adopt in the face of organized political power. This political dimension complicates the claim that there could be a unitary Marxist theory of the state. It draws attention to both the historical and ideological context within which such theories were forged.

A discussion of the state from a Marxist standpoint thus confronts at least three obstacles: the incomplete character of Marx's theorization of the state; the question of whether the state is adequately represented by the influential metaphor of the productive "base" and the juridical and political "superstructure"; and the questions of *how* and *why* it can be claimed that the state is autonomous from the forces and relations of production. Given these difficulties, any discussion of the "Marxist theory of the state" is necessarily inseparable from the *history of Marxist arguments about the state*, as they were conducted on shifting political, strategic, and theoretical terrains over the course of the tradition's development.

Marx on the state

Marx's early writings on the state were primarily formulated as a critique of Hegel's political and social philosophy. Hegel understood the modern state to be the embodiment of reason and universality as developed over the course of human history. As such, its role was to reconcile the social fragmentation caused by narrow conceptions of individual freedom (property rights, commerce) facilitated by the emergence of bourgeois society in England and the radical political egalitarianism of the French Revolution. By virtue of their membership in the political community, individuals could transcend their personal, familial, corporate, and commercial interests, thereby attaining the self-consciousness of their own freedom in the objective laws of the state. Hegel saw constitutional monarchy as the state form that best combined the universal lawmaking power of the legislature (elected by corporate bodies in civil society) and the particular executive power of the civil service, forming a unity represented in the figure of the individual sovereign. The civil service in particular, composed of qualified professionals and open to entrance from all ranks of society, was tasked with upholding the "universal interest of the state" (Hegel 1991, 329).

Marx's critique rested on the claim that by locating universality and equality in the bourgeois constitutional state (*Rechtsstaat*), Hegel inverted the relationship between the state and civil society. Hegel had correctly recognized that bourgeois claims to the right to private property created social antagonisms that alienated individuals from both their social bonds and the products of their labor. However, overcoming this condition would not take place through the state, which was itself merely the objectified form taken by social alienation. Rather, it would take changes in the structures of the family and civil society – those very spheres that Hegel had subsumed within the state (Marx 1992a; 1992b).

Marx traced the growing separation between civil society and the state as part of the transition from the estate and guild societies of the late feudal era to the consolidation of mercantile capitalist society in northwestern Europe during the eighteenth century. During this time, law took on an increasingly abstract and formal character,

as it replaced estates as the primary way of mediating between individuals in the new “independent” realm of civil society. The claim to equal political rights made during the French Revolution was the apex of the separation that had emerged between the universal political identity of the citizen and the actual social standing of the individual in civil society. The state now came to appear as the realm where individuals’ political equality as citizens could be recognized and expressed.

Marx argued this was an illusory freedom, for the state merely reinforced their political alienation from their material existence as producing and consuming beings. Bourgeois rights were thus a vehicle for *political* emancipation, but so long as civil society remained fractured by property rights, formal equality under the law was not enough to overcome individuals’ estrangement from their social existence (Marx 1992c). True emancipation could not occur through the “merely political state” but by the democratic reappropriation of the power that had been alienated in bourgeois society. Writing that “the state is an abstraction. Only the people is a concrete reality,” Marx (1992, 85) counterposed Hegel’s constitutional monarchy to a radical republican conception of democracy. Democracy was the “essence of all political constitutions,” because it took socialized human beings as its starting point (Marx 1992, 88). Under a democratic constitution, the alienated and mystified universality of the political state would disappear, for the constitution and the law would rest on the unalienated and direct “self-determination of the people” (Marx 1992b, 89).

Although he retained this fundamental idea of the necessary overcoming of the state, beginning in the late 1840s Marx largely shifted from examining the state’s philosophical underpinnings to more concrete historical and political analysis, and the state’s specific role in relation to class struggles. In the *German Ideology*, he and Engels maintained that the modern state had emerged from the social division of labor until it separated itself from civil society to become “the form in which the individuals of a ruling class assert their common interests” (Marx and Engels 2010a, 90). Two years later, writing with the goal of articulating the principles of the communist movement, the *Manifesto* referred to the executive of the “modern representative state” as a “committee for managing the

common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie” (Marx and Engels 2010b, 486.) Although less a definition than a device of political rhetoric, this framing nevertheless suggests a relationship where the economically dominant class directly controls and exploits state institutions for its own benefit.

However, in the *Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, Marx sketched a picture of an exceptional form of the state that superimposed itself over society to arrest the sharpening antagonisms between different class fractions. Marx described this state as a “parasitic body” composed of a bureaucratic and military organization that “enmeshes, controls, regulates, supervises and regiments civil society” (Marx 2010b, 139, 185). Although the Bonapartist state was the result of an equilibrium of class forces, it only *appeared* to be autonomous. While it was not directly controlled by the bourgeoisie, nor acted in its immediate interests, the state nevertheless secured the political and social order under which capital accumulation could continue to take place. Marx’s overlooked but poignant description of the state as the “concentrated and organized force of society” (Marx 2010a, 739) in Volume I of *Capital* is consistent with this earlier formulation.

Marx’s analysis of the state thus bridged two related but distinct standpoints: the philosophical perspective of his earlier writing, where the state is a juridical fiction masking the class interests openly expressed in civil society, and a historical-political perspective where it is a social relation that reproduces a specific balance of forces in society. Although this has been explained as the gap between the young and the mature Marx (Althusser 1965), there are also certain continuities. Importantly, the overcoming of political alienation by the eventual reabsorption of the state into society – what Engels (2010d, 321, 713) later called the “withering away” or dying out of the state – reappears in later writings such as *The Civil War in France*.

Nevertheless, following his concerted critique of Hegel’s political philosophy, Marx’s writings on the state remained fragmentary. Later interpreters have had to grapple with this gap and its implications. For example, it has been suggested that Marx’s critique of the bureaucracy in the earlier writings captured the essence of his thoughts on the state, making it less of a priority than the critique of political economy (Avineri 1968,

51–2). However, this interpretation should be questioned given that the mature Marx planned to write about the state as part of the broader critique of political economy. Others have pointed to at least two different understandings of the relationship between the economically dominant class and the state, which left unresolved the question of under what conditions it could be claimed that the state acted in its interests (Miliband 1965; Van den Berg 1988). A second unresolved tension was the relationship between the economic-productive base and the political, legal, and ideological superstructure through which these social relations were mediated and expressed. In both cases, the question concerned the degree of autonomy that the state had from the immediate relations of production and the direct economic interests of the bourgeoisie.

State as superstructure

Following Marx's death in 1883, the systematization of his writings by Engels and Karl Kautsky into a coherent body of thought dovetailed with the rise of the Social Democratic Party in Germany. The predominant approach to the state in the German social democratic movement was the topological metaphor of the productive "base" consisting of the forces and relations of production, and the corresponding "superstructure" of the political and juridical forms through which it would be expressed. Since it prioritized the historical and technological development of the material productive forces of society in giving rise to corresponding relations of production, this perspective, later coming to be known as "orthodox Marxism," was seen as reducing the political and juridical domains to secondary ideological expressions of these primary social forces.

The base-superstructure metaphor has some textual warrant in Marx's writings. Most schematically, it appears in the 1859 Preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, where Marx wrote that the "legal and political superstructure" arises from the "totality" of the relations of production that "constitutes the economic structure of society" (Marx 2010c, 263) – a framing that he would also later directly repeat in *Capital*. Similarly, in the unpublished *German Ideology*, Marx and Engels noted that "the social organization evolving

directly out of production and commerce" in all ages forms the "basis of the State and of the rest of the idealistic superstructure" (Marx 1978b, 89).

Engels further developed this view in his *Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*, suggesting that the state had emerged from the gradual division of labor in settled civilizations to moderate the resulting class antagonisms. As such, it was "the product of society at a particular stage of development," having "arisen out of society but placing itself above it, and alienating itself more and more from it" (Engels 2010c, 269). However, important qualifications can also be found in Engels' letters from that period pointing to the reciprocal effect of the superstructure upon the base. As the bureaucratic and military organization of the capitalist state allowed it to obtain some independent power from the economic movement of society, the two could find themselves at cross-purposes, in a situation where the economic usually predominated but "must also be reacted upon by the political trend which it has itself induced and which has been endowed with relative independence" (Engels 2010a, 60). Furthermore, constitutions and juridical forms frequently determined the form taken by class struggles. In a modern state "law must not only correspond to the general economic condition and be its expression, but must also be an *internally coherent* expression," facilitating the growth of jurisprudence as a new "independent sphere" of social practice and preventing the law from being the "blunt, unmitigated, unadulterated expression of the domination of a class" (Engels 2010a, 60–61).

Despite these nuances, the Marxism of the Second International (1889–1916) largely saw the political and legal domains as determined by a relationship of correspondence between the means and relations of production. Within the capitalist mode of production, the political and juridical superstructure was seen as necessarily mirroring and reproducing the conditions for commodity production and the private appropriation of surplus value – namely, that the means of production were held as private property, and labor power was nominally "free" to be contractually exchanged for a wage. Leading theoreticians like Engels, Kautsky (1971; 2020), Eduard Bernstein (1961), and Rosa Luxemburg (2008) all saw the bourgeois constitutional

republic as the political form that expressed this advanced stage of industrial capitalism – and (with the exception of Bernstein) its inevitable crisis tendency.

Evolutionary and reformist currents in the Second International following Bernstein gradually arrived at the implicit position that the state was a neutral institution that could be progressively taken over through regular electoral participation by working class parties. Against this current, V.I. Lenin advanced a critique of social democracy's reliance on trade union activism at the expense of direct political struggles against state power. Whereas reformists saw the state as a neutral apparatus, for Lenin, since the state emerged as the necessary outcome of the irreconcilable class antagonisms, it remained a "special coercive force" or machine functioning as the "instrument for the oppression of one class by another" (Lenin 1967; 1975). Lenin's view of the state as a repressive instrument of class power undoubtedly remained the definitive and most influential treatment of the state within the Communist movements and parties of the twentieth century.

Through the 1920s and 1930s, the gradual codification of Marxism-Leninism in legal and state theory in the USSR continued to rely on the separation between base and superstructure. The most noteworthy and sophisticated treatment of law and the state in that period was Pashukanis' (1978; 1980) commodity-exchange theory. In distinction from his contemporaries, Pashukanis did not subscribe to an instrumentalist conception of law, focusing on the form of the law rather than its content. Pashukanis theorized law as an expression of the contractual basis of capitalist society, such that the legal form was structurally homologous to and derivative of the commodity form predominant in bourgeois civil society. Consequently, the revolution in the relations of production, and the completed transition to communist society would lead to the withering away of both law and the state, to be replaced by technical administration.

There has been a twofold critique of the base-superstructure metaphor from within the Marxist tradition. First, notwithstanding the aforementioned letters by Engels, its positivistic treatment of the base as the "real" space of the relations of production implies a unidirectional model that cannot account for the conditions under which the superstructure

can have a reciprocal causal effect on the forces and relations of production (Williams 2005). Equally important, the metaphor posits the two levels in a relation of external causality, such that, even if one allows for reciprocal influence, the state and law still exist as reflections of an independently constituted economic and productive sphere. However, if we assume that ownership of the means of production and relations of wage labor are always already politically and juridically mediated social relationships, then this explanatory primacy of the base cannot be maintained (Wood 2016).

The (relative) autonomy of the state?

The development of Marxist thought on the state following the Russian Revolution, especially outside of the Soviet Union, can be understood as a series of attempts to theoretically ground the possible autonomy of the state beyond the "economism" or "scientific socialism" of the Second and Third Internationals. Although these attempts often rested on very different epistemological premises, they shared a desire to trace the activities of the state beyond its repressive and coercive role, to examine the reciprocity between the state and civil society, the importance of ideology to subject formation, and the possibility of class consciousness and class struggle under the conditions of monopoly capitalism.

Between the 1920s and 1940s, among the notable contributions in the German-speaking world were the investigations of the rule of law and the exceptional state by Franz Neumann and Otto Kirchheimer (Scheuerman 1994; 1996), and of nationalism, culture, and constitutionalism by Austro-Marxists such as Max Adler, Otto Bauer, and Karl Renner (Bottomore and Goode 1978; Blum and Smaldone 2017; 2018; Adler 2019). A second major tributary of thinking about the state came from debates in Italian Marxism following the rise of Fascism. Although Gramsci's (1971) prison writings did not receive a wide audience until the 1950s, his innovative treatments of hegemony, the relationship between structural and conjunctural crises, and revolutionary political strategy were groundbreaking contributions in the postwar context for both Western communist parties and the New Left.

Beginning in the 1960s, the translation of Gramsci into English and the major rethorization of Marxism by Althusser and his circle further facilitated the critique of the base-superstructure model. While Althusser followed Lenin in asserting that the state was a repressive apparatus or machine, he developed the complementary notion of the ideological state apparatuses (including political parties and the law) as realizing and reproducing dominant ideology through interpellation by material practices (Althusser 2014). Moreover, by focusing on the concept of the mode of production, Althusser and his collaborators (Althusser et al. 2015) introduced a model of structural causality in which the economic, political, and ideological levels interacted in a complex way that excluded a linear determination by the economic – thereby counteracting the Stalinist orthodoxy that changes in the ideological superstructure would follow from a revolution in the base.

The 1970s marked the last major wave of developments in Marxist analyses of the state to date. The Miliband-Poulantzas debate (Miliband 1969; 1970; 1973; Poulantzas 1969; 1973; 1976) revolved around the question of the state's relative autonomy from the capitalist class. However, its reception in the Anglosphere schematically separated them into competing “instrumentalist” and “structuralist” approaches to the capitalist state, where the capitalist class either controlled the state through the influence of personal networks, or the state's independence was structurally guaranteed by its role in the capitalist mode of production (Gold, Lo, and Wright 1975).

In the wake of the debate and the crisis of the neo-Keynesian regime of accumulation in the 1970s, American scholars attempted to supplement the perceived shortcomings of Marxist theory with insights from Weberian sociology (Block 1977; Skocpol 1980; Katznelson 1981; Skocpol, Evans, and Rueschemeyer 1985). In Germany, two concurrent lines of inquiry unfolded. One involved the second generation of Frankfurt School critical theory (Habermas 1975; Offe 1984) focusing on the state's strategies for popular-democratic legitimation. The other was the “capital logic” school (Holloway and Picciotto 1978), which sought to derive the form of the capitalist state from a starting point with the category of capital. A second

tributary of thought influenced by the state derivation debate, the New German Reading of Marx, and the Open Marxist current has been “political form analysis” (Bonefeld 2021), as represented in various forms in the works of Werner Bonefeld, Simon Clarke, Heide Gerstenberger, and Joachim Hirsch (Bonefeld, Gunn, and Psychopedis 1992; Clarke 1991). The latter has advanced a view of the state as the contradictory political expression of the totality of capitalist social relations. An adjacent framework that has been in dialogue with the above is Jessop's (2016) development of a “strategic-relational approach” that sees the state as a social relation shaped both by structural incentives and the particular balance of social forces in a given conjuncture.

State theory in the twenty-first century

Despite this general interest in Marxist critiques of pluralist and elitist theories of power, by the mid-1980s, the research framework entered a period of decline alongside the waning of the New Left (Khachaturian 2019). Re-evaluations of the legacy of Marxist debates on the state from the 1990s onward have attempted to either synthesize the different strands of analysis or clarify existing divisions (Jessop 1990, 2002; Aronowitz and Bratsis 2002; Barrow 1993, 2016; Das 1996; O’Kane 2019a, 2019b). It has been difficult to formulate an overarching consensus, not least of all because plausible textual evidence in Marx's writings can be found for a variety of theoretical positions (Barrow 2000).

This lack of theoretical orthodoxy has largely turned Marxist state theory today into an open-ended and pluralistic research framework (e.g., Munro 2019; O’Connell and Özsü 2021; Hunter, Khachaturian, and Nanopoulos, 2023). In addition to new work in political economy (McCarthy 2017; Maher 2022) and political and legal theory (Shoikhedbrod 2019), at least four new research directions have emerged to supplement previous omissions. First, growing interest in social reproduction has reopened debates about the state's role in reproducing gender roles and the coordination of the non-waged labor necessary for capital accumulation (Vogel 2013; Bhattacharya 2017; Munro 2019). Second, recent discussions of “authoritarian neoliberalism” (Tansel

2017; Bruff and Tansel 2019; Ducange and Keycheyan 2019) have explored how new forms of the capitalist state exacerbate the crises of representative democracy. As a corollary, among US scholars, this has also led to growing interest in the role played by the state's coercive apparatuses, especially in connection to the carceral state (Gilmore 2007; Camp 2016), police power (Bargu 2019), and surveillance practices (Neocleous 2008; McQuade 2019). Lastly, the urgency of the climate crisis has drawn attention to the state as a site of social struggle over resource extraction and climate change mitigation (Riofrancos 2020; Battistoni, 2023).

What these strands of research share is a rejection of a view of the state as a juridical entity circumscribed by its formal constitution. There is agreement that the state has a *material* existence, as a set of institutions, but also as an ensemble of political, ideological, legal, economic, and social practices and relationships. These practices secure the state's claim to legitimacy by reproducing its effect as the representative of the general social interest, while continuing to facilitate capital accumulation, mediating between competing fractions of the capitalist class and integrating them into the global circulation of capital. Together, the research described above continues to revamp and adapt the history of Marxist thinking about the state to new problems, contributing to the ongoing development of this explanatory framework.

RAFAEL KHACHATURIAN

References

- Adler, Max. 2019 [1922]. *The Marxist Conception of the State: A Contribution to the Differentiation of the Sociological and the Juristic Method*. Leiden: Brill.
- Althusser, Louis. 1965. *For Marx*. London: Verso.
- Althusser, Louis. 2014. *On the Reproduction of Capitalism*. London: Verso.
- Althusser, Louis, Etienne Balibar, Roger Establet, Pierre Macherey, and Jacques Ranciere. 2015. *Reading Capital*. London: Verso.
- Aronowitz, Stanley, and Peter Bratsis, eds. 2002. *Paradigm Lost: State Theory Reconsidered*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Avineri, Shlomo. 1968. *The Social and Political Thought of Karl Marx*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bargu, Banu. 2019. "Police Power: The Biopolitical State Apparatus and Differential Interpellations." *Rethinking Marxism* 31, no. 3: 291–317.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 1993. *Critical Theories of the State: Marxist, Neomarxist, Postmarxist*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 2000. "The Marx Problem in Marxian State Theory." *Science & Society* 64, no. 1: 87–118.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 2016. *Toward a Critical Theory of States: The Poulantzas-Miliband Debate after Globalization*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Battistoni, Alyssa. 2023. "State, Capital, Nature: State Theory for the Capitalocene." In *Marxism and the Capitalist State: Towards a New Debate*, edited by Rob Hunter, Rafael Khachaturian, and Eva Nanopoulos. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave.
- Bernstein, Eduard. 1961 [1899]. *Evolutionary Socialism*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Bhattacharya, Tithi, ed. 2017. *Social Reproduction Theory: Remapping Class, Recentering Oppression*. London: Pluto Press.
- Block, Fred. 1977. "The Ruling Class Does Not Rule: Notes on the Marxist Theory of the State." *Socialist Revolution* 33: 6–28.
- Blum, Mark E., and William Smaldone, eds. 2017. *Austro-Marxism: The Ideology of Unity*. Vol. I. Chicago: Haymarket.
- Blum, Mark E., and William Smaldone, eds. 2018. *Austro-Marxism: The Ideology of Unity*. Vol. II. Chicago: Haymarket.
- Bonefeld, Werner, Richard Gunn, and Kosmas Psychopedis, eds. 1992. *Open Marxism I: Dialectics and History*. London: Pluto Press.
- Bonefeld, Werner. 2021. "On the State as Political Form of Society." *Science & Society* 83, no. 4: 177–84.
- Bottomore, Tom, and Patrick Goode, eds. 1978. *Austro-Marxism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bruff, Ian, and Cemal Burak Tansel, eds. 2019. *Authoritarian Neoliberalism: Philosophies, Practices, Contestations*. Taylor & Francis.
- Camp, Jordan T. 2016. *Incarcerating the Crisis: Freedom Struggles and the Rise of the Neoliberal State*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Clarke, Simon, ed. 1991. *The State Debate*. Houndmills, UK: Macmillan.
- Das, Raju J. 1996. "State Theories: A Critical Analysis." *Science & Society* 60, no. 1: 27–57.
- Ducange, Jean-Numa and Razmig Keucheyan, eds. 2019. *The End of the Democratic State: Nicos Poulantzas, a Marxism for the 21st Century*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Engels, Frederick. 2010a [1890]. "Letter to Conrad Schmidt." In *Marx-Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 49, 57–65. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Engels, Frederick. 2010c [1884]. *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. In *Marx-Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 26, 129–276. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Engels, Frederick. 2010d [1880]. "Socialism: Utopian and Scientific." In *Marx-Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 24, 281–325. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

- Gilmore, Ruth Wilson. 2007. *Golden Gulag: Prisons, Surplus, Crisis, and Opposition in Globalizing California*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gold, David A., Clarence Y. H. Lo, and Erik Olin Wright. 1975. "Recent Developments in Marxist Theories of the Capitalist State." *Monthly Review* 27, no. 5: 29–51.
- Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, edited by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. New York: International Publishers.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1975. *Legitimation Crisis*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hegel, G.W.F. 1991. *Elements of the Philosophy of Right*, edited by Allen W. Wood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holloway, John, and Sol Picciotto, eds. 1978. *State and Capital: A Marxist Debate*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hunter, Rob, Rafael Khachaturian, and Eva Nanopoulos, eds. 2023. *Marxism and the Capitalist State: Towards a New Debate*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jessop, Bob. 1990. *State Theory: Putting the Capitalist State in Its Place*. Cambridge: Wiley.
- Jessop, Bob. 2002. *The Future of the Capitalist State*. Cambridge: Wiley.
- Jessop, Bob. 2016. *The State: Past, Present, Future*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Katznelson, Ira. 1981. "Lenin or Weber? Choices in Marxist Theories of Politics." *Political Studies*, 29, no. 4: 632–40.
- Kautsky, Karl. 1971 [1892]. *The Class Struggle*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Kautsky, Karl. 2020 [1893/1911]. "Parliamentarism and Democracy." In *Karl Kautsky on Democracy and Republicanism*, edited by Ben Lewis. Leiden: Brill.
- Khachaturian, Rafael. 2019. "Bringing What State Back In? Neo-Marxism and the Origin of the Committee on States and Social Structures." *Political Research Quarterly* 72, no. 3: 714–26.
- Lenin, V.I. 1967 [1919]. "The State: A Lecture Delivered at the Sverdlov University." July 11, 1919. In *Selected Works* Vol. III, 243–58. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Lenin, V.I. 1975 [1918]. "The State and Revolution." In *Selected Works*, Vol. II, 238–327. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Luxemburg, Rosa. 2008 [1899]. "Reform or Revolution." In *The Essential Rosa Luxemburg*, edited by Helen Scott, 41–104. Chicago: Haymarket.
- Maher, Stephen. 2022. *Corporate Capitalism and the Integral State*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Marx, Karl. 1973. *Grundrisse*, translated by Martin Nicolaus. London: Penguin.
- Marx, Karl. 1992a. "A Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right. Introduction." In *Early Writings*, 243–58. London: Penguin.
- Marx, Karl. 1992b. "Critique of Hegel's Doctrine of the State." In *Early Writings*, 57–198. London: Penguin.
- Marx, Karl. 1992c. "On the Jewish Question." In *Early Writings*, 211–42. London: Penguin.
- Marx, Karl. 2010a. *Capital*, Volume I. *Marx-Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 35. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Marx, Karl. 2010b. "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte." In *Marx & Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 11, 99–197. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Marx, Karl. 2010c. "Preface to a Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy." In *Marx & Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 29, 261–5. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. 12010a. "The German Ideology: Part I." In *Marx & Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 5, 21–93. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. 2010b. "Manifesto of the Communist Party." *Marx & Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 6, 477–519. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- McCarthy, Michael A. 2017. *Dismantling Solidarity: Capitalist Politics and American Pensions since the New Deal*. Ithaca: ILR Press.
- McQuade, Brendan. 2019. *Pacifying the Homeland: Intelligence Fusion and Mass Supervision*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Meiksins Wood, Ellen. 2016. "Rethinking Base and Superstructure." In *Democracy Against Capitalism: Renewing Historical Materialism*, 49–75. London: Verso.
- Miliband, Ralph. 1965. "Marx and the State." In *Socialist Register*, edited by R. Miliband and J. Saville, 278–95. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Miliband, Ralph. 1969. *The State in Capitalist Society*. New York: Basic Books.
- Miliband, Ralph. 1970. "The Capitalist State: Reply to Poulantzas." *New Left Review* 59 (January–February): 53–60.
- Miliband, Ralph. 1973. "Poulantzas and the Capitalist State." *New Left Review* 82: 83–92.
- Munro, Kirstin. 2019. "'Social Reproduction Theory', Social Reproduction, and Household Production." *Science & Society* 83, no. 4: 451–68.
- Munro, Kirstin, ed. 2021. "Symposium: Marxist State Theory Today." *Science & Society* 85, no. 2: 162–206.
- Neocleous, Mark. 2008. *Critique of Security*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- O'Connell, Paul and Umut Özsu, eds. 2021. *Research Handbook on Law and Marxism*. Cheltenham, UK.
- Offe, Claus. 1984. *Contradictions of the Welfare State*, edited by John Keane. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.
- O'Kane, Chris. 2019a. "We Need a New State Debate (Part One)." Legal Form (blog), April

13. <https://legalform.blog/2019/04/13/we-need-a-new-state-debate-part-one-chris-okane/>.
- O'Kane, Chris. 2019b. "We Need a New State Debate (Part Two)." Legal Form (blog), April 23. <https://legalform.blog/2019/04/23/we-need-a-new-state-debate-part-two-chris-okane/>.
- Pashukanis, Evgeny B. 1978 [1924]. *Law & Marxism: A General Theory*. London: Pluto Press.
- Pashukanis, Evgeny. 1980. *Pashukanis: Selected Writings on Marxism and Law*, edited by Piers Beirne and Robert Sharlet. London: Academic Press.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. 1969. "The Problem of the Capitalist State." *New Left Review* 58 (November–December): 67–78.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. 1973. *Political Power and Social Classes*. London: New Left Books.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. 1976. "The Capitalist State: A Reply to Miliband and Laclau." *New Left Review* 95 (January/February): 63–83.
- Riofrancos, Thea. 2020. *Resource Radicals: From Petro-Nationalism to Post-Extractivism in Ecuador*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Scheuerman, William E. 1994. *Between the Norm and the Exception: The Frankfurt School and the Rule of Law*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.
- Scheuerman, William E., ed. 1996. *The Rule of Law Under Siege: Selected Essays by Franz Neumann and Otto Kirchheimer*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Shoikhedbrod, Igor. 2019. *Revisiting Marx's Critique of Liberalism: Rethinking Justice, Legality, and Rights*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Skocpol, Theda. 1980. "Political Response to Capitalist Crisis: Neo-Marxist Theories of the State and the Case of the New Deal." *Politics & Society* 10, no. 2: 155–201.
- Skocpol, Theda, Peter Evans, and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, eds. 1985. *Bringing the State Back In*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tansel, Cemal Burak, ed. 2017. *States of Discipline: Authoritarian Neoliberalism and the Contested Reproduction of the Capitalist Order*. London: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Van den Berg, Axel. 1988. *The Immanent Utopia: From Marxism on the State to the State of Marxism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Vogel, Lise. 2013. *Marxism and the Oppression of Women: Toward a Unitary Theory*. Leiden: Brill.
- Wacquant, Loic. 2009. *Punishing the Poor: The Neoliberal Government of Social Insecurity*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Williams, Raymond. 2005. "Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory." In *Culture and Materialism*, 31–49. London: Verso.

See also

Marxism; Theories of the State II; Feminism and the State

19. Marxist theories of the state II

The concept of the state occupied a central place in political science until the 1950s when it was temporarily displaced by a concept of the “political system” that originated in Talcott Parsons’ systems analysis. Parsons’ (1951, 75, 126–7) sociology identified the political system with individual and collective behaviors that provide “a center of integration for all aspects” of the social system. David Easton (1953, 106) imported this concept into political science by declaring that “neither the state nor power is a concept that serves to bring together political research” and instead he defined the political system as “those interactions through which values are authoritatively allocated for a society.” Systems analysis was tied closely to various theories of decision-making, but most notably to pluralist theory, which viewed decision-making as the outcome of peaceful bargaining and compromise between interest groups in society. Pluralist theory implicitly assumed that key sources of power such as wealth, force, status, and knowledge, if not equally distributed, are at least widely diffused among a plurality of competing groups in capitalist societies.

However, a return to the state in political science, sociology, and history was launched by the publication of Nicos Poulantzas’ *Pouvoir Politique et Classes Sociales* (1968) and Ralph Miliband’s *The State in Capitalist Society* (1969), which directly challenged pluralist theory and systems analysis (Barrow, 1993; Jessop, 1982). Miliband and Poulantzas both drew on a radical tradition identified with the writings of Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, V.I. Lenin, and Antonio Gramsci and considered a theory of the state anchored in this tradition to be the main alternative to the dominant bourgeois social science.

The Poulantzas-Miliband debate

Miliband’s writings became identified with an instrumentalist theory of the state, which was subsequently adopted by many scholars conducting research on political institutions and public policy. Prior to Miliband, the instrumentalist theory of the state had been

articulated by Paul Sweezy (1942, 243), who asserted that the state is “an instrument in the hands of the ruling class for enforcing and guaranteeing the stability of the class structure itself.”

Poulantzas’ well-publicized methodological differences with Miliband were deeply influenced by the French structuralist philosopher Louis Althusser. These disputes were aired in the *New Left Review* in a series of widely heralded polemical exchanges that became known as the Poulantzas-Miliband debate (Miliband 1970, 1973; Poulantzas 1969, 1976a; Laclau 1975). The debate mainly revolved around Poulantzas’ (1969, 70–71) claim that Miliband’s empirical and institutional analysis of the state in capitalist society gave the impression that “social classes or ‘groups’ are in some way reducible to *inter-personal* relations ... and the State is itself reducible to inter-personal relations of ‘individuals’ composing social groups and ‘individuals’ composing the State apparatus.” Poulantzas insisted that this method of analysis failed to comprehend “social classes and the State as *objective structures*, and their relations as an *objective system of regular connections*, a structure and a system whose agents, ‘men’, are in the words of Marx, ‘bearers’ of it.” Thus, Poulantzas (1978, 45) argued that the state is best understood by its general function in the capitalist mode of production as “*the regulating factor of its global equilibrium as a system*.”

The Poulantzas-Miliband debate echoed widely across the 1970s, and following their initial exchange in 1969–70, Marxist political theorists around the world quickly lined up around the question of whether Miliband’s “instrumentalism” or Poulantzas’ “structuralism” could rightly claim to be *the* Marxist theory of the state (Clarke 1991). The Poulantzas-Miliband debate concluded in 1976 in what appeared to be a profoundly disappointing stalemate between the world’s two most renowned Marxist theorists of the state (Barrow 2002; 2016, Chaps. 1–2). Nevertheless, the exchange between Poulantzas and Miliband was a paradigmatic event that set in motion a broader “state debate” that seemed to fracture Marxist political theory into warring schools of thought (Jessop 1977; Carnoy 1984; Alford and Friedland 1985).

Requisites for a Marxist theory of the state

The apparent fragmentation of state theory into instrumentalist (Miliband 1969), structuralist (Poulantzas 1978a), and then Hegelian (or systems-analytic) (O'Connor 1973) schools of thought generated an apparent methodological stalemate (Gold et al. 1975a, 1975b). However, one of the most promising, if neglected, paths forward beyond the stalemate was proposed by Leo Panitch (1977, 5), who postulated that a fully developed theory of the state in capitalist society should meet at least three basic requirements:

It must clearly delimit the complex of institutions that go to make up the state. It must demonstrate concretely, rather than just define abstractly, the linkages between the state and the system of class inequality in the society, particularly its ties to the dominant social class. And it must specify so far as possible the functions of the state under the capitalist mode of production.

Panitch was the only state theorist at the time (and perhaps for the next two decades) who argued that each of the three approaches – represented by Ralph Miliband, Nicos Poulantzas, and James O'Connor – contributed to answering one of these questions. Rather than seeing their works as methodologically incompatible, Panitch suggested that the insights of each theorist should be integrated into concrete analyses of the political development of actually existing states.

Panitch argues that the first requisite for a Marxist theory of the state is to provide a clear definition of the state, including a description of its internal organization and its sociological boundaries. Panitch (1977, 6) followed Miliband's lead in defining the state as:

... a complex of institutions, including government, but also including the bureaucracy (embodied in the civil service as well as in public corporations, central banks, regulatory commissions, etc.), the military, the judiciary, representative assemblies, and (very importantly for Canada) what Miliband called the sub-central levels of government, this is, provincial executives, legislatures, bureaucracies, and municipal government institutions (Cf. Miliband 1969, 49).

This definition of the state has three significant implications for a theoretical analysis of the state in capitalist society. First, the definition draws a theoretically important distinction between government and the state. Miliband (1969, 49–50) had chastised liberal pluralists and parliamentary socialists for their mistaken belief that “the assumption of governmental power is equivalent to the acquisition of state power.” Miliband understood that the accession to governmental power at various points in the twentieth century by liberal, labor, and social democratic *governments* was accompanied by their simultaneous failure to conquer *state power* in its diverse forms and places within a more expansive state system. The fact that a socialist government might control the commanding heights of the parliamentary and executive branches of government, whether by election or revolution, did not automatically entail its control of the military, the police, the intelligence agencies, the civil service, the legal system, the sub-national governments, regulatory agencies, public corporations, and so on. Thus, Panitch (1977, 7) notes that one reason for clearly delineating the institutions of the state is that “it leads us away from assuming, as social democrats consistently do, that election to governmental power is equivalent to the acquisition of state power.”

A second important element of this definition of the state is the distinction between the state system and the political and ideological systems. Panitch (1977, 6) observes that an equally important aspect of this definition of the state is “what it leaves out. It leaves out political parties, the privately-owned media, the church, pressure groups.” Panitch (1977, 6–7) considered these institutions part of the political and ideological systems and while they “no doubt form part of the system of power in a liberal-democratic capitalist society ... they remain autonomous from the state” (except in the case of fascism). Thus, Panitch (like Miliband) rejected Poulantzas' and Althusser's claim that institutions such as churches, the educational system, political parties, the press, radio, television, publishing, the family, and so on should all be brought within the realm of state theory as components of an ideological state apparatus (Althusser 1971; Miliband 1973, 87, 88 fn. 16). This difference in how one defines the institutional boundaries of the state was more than an analytical quibble; it is the defini-

tional basis for drawing a distinction between state power and class power. State power is not the only form, nor the only site, of ruling class domination and class struggle, but it is the autonomy of the political and ideological systems *from* the state that opens theoretical spaces for political and industrial action by the working class.

Finally, by defining the state as an institutional complex, one calls attention to the fact that the state system in capitalist societies is a sprawling network of political institutions loosely coordinated, if at all, through mechanisms that sometimes provide tenuous cohesion. These fissures in the state, as well as the uneven development of its various sub-apparatuses, provide openings for the non-dominant classes to capture parts of the state. It is the sprawling diffuseness of the modern capitalist state that allows it to be what Poulantzas calls an arena of class struggle (Poulantzas 1978, 115). Importantly, this means that the conquest of state power by the working class is never an all or nothing proposition. The class struggle is – in the Gramscian phrase – a war of position and a war of maneuver waged on many fronts, in many trenches, with shifting lines of battle, where victories and defeats occur side by side on the same day (Gramsci 1971, 108–10, 229–35). The conquest of state power is never absolute; it is never uncontested; and it is never complete because it is an on-going and contingent *political* struggle. An institutional definition of the state effectively mandates an analysis of state power that refers to specific institutional configurations that may vary widely from one capitalist society to another, and where over time class hegemony may shift in one direction or another within the same society.

The second requisite for a Marxist theory of the state is that it “demonstrate concretely” the nexus between state and capital; that is, it must concretely identify the mechanisms that make a state “capitalist” as opposed to merely a state. All states perform a coordinating role that Poulantzas (1978, 44–5, 47 fn. 17) identified as the general function of the state. The general maintenance function is the “repressive function” common to all states and, therefore, it requires a repressive state apparatus. In this respect, the general function of the state is consistent with Max Weber’s (1946, 78, 82–3) definition of the state as “a human community that (success-

fully) claims the *monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force* within a given territory.”

The repressive function of the state ensures the economic and social dominance of the ruling class simply by maintaining social stability and ensuring the extended reproduction of the mode of production in which a particular ruling class is dominant. At the same time, this general maintenance function implies a certain degree of relative autonomy from the ruling class. The state normally uses repression against sub-altern classes to maintain law and order, but during periods of mass social upheaval the state may find that it more efficient to restore order by making concessions to sub-altern classes even if these concessions come at the short-term expense of the ruling class (cf. Moore 1966; Skocpol 1979, 1980).

However, as Panitch (1977, 4) observes, the general function of the state is always “framed within the boundaries set by the mode of production, and the relations of production of a given society.” Consequently, it is always necessary to specify these structural constraints in terms of a specific mode of production. In the case of a state in a capitalist society, one must be able to identify the types of structural constraints make the state a *capitalist* state. One can accept Poulantzas’ general theoretical claim regarding the importance of structural constraints, but Poulantzas’ initial articulation of this principle was too abstract and overly deterministic. Poulantzas never specified any structural limits to state action within the capitalist mode of production, nor did he explain how these constraints worked in practice.

In contrast, Miliband had given significant attention to the problem of structural constraints (Barrow 2016, 90–94), but this analysis was completely overlooked in the heated fury of the Poulantzas-Miliband debate. Miliband’s concept of structural constraint was theoretically underdeveloped, but Miliband explicitly introduced the principle of business confidence and structural constraint as factors facilitating a natural alliance between state and capital, regardless of who *governs*, because the state is dependent on capital investment for economic growth and tax revenue. The latter are especially necessary to the modern state’s political legitimacy because the state’s legitimacy is dependent on its ability to deliver needed public services and to ensure gainful employment for the

working class. Thus, Miliband understood that this structural constraint is fundamentally important to ensuring that the state in capitalist society "functions" as a capitalist state.

However, what was also lost in the fog of the Poulantzas-Miliband debate were significant contributions by Ernest Mandel (1971), Amy Beth Bridges (1974), Claus Offe (1975), and Michael H. Best and William Connolly (1976) that met Panitch's demand for historical and empirical specificity. In her early critique of Poulantzas, Bridges identified two constraint mechanisms that were later widely adopted by state theorists through the works of Fred Block (1977) and Charles Lindblom (1982). Bridges's main theoretical claim was that the state functions in the interests of the capitalist class because the state's own fiscal solvency and legitimacy is immediately dependent on the overall performance of the economy, where investment and employment decisions are controlled by capitalists. Offe (1975) elegantly codified these state-capital relationships as the dependency principle. Mandel identified public debt as another structural mechanism that rendered the state dependent on business confidence.

Finally, the third requisite for a Marxist theory of the state is that it "must specify the functions of the state in a capitalist mode of production" (Panitch 1977, 5). Panitch identified the repressive function of the state with its general maintenance function, but he drew on James O'Connor's *The Fiscal Crisis of the State* (1973) to identify two additional state functions that are historically specific to the liberal-democratic state in a capitalist mode of production: accumulation and legitimation. The state must try to maintain or create conditions in which profitable capital accumulation is possible. However, the state also must try to maintain or create the conditions for social harmony (legitimacy). To promote capital accumulation, the state must promote a favorable business climate, but to promote democratic legitimacy, the state must pursue a variety of policies that undermine business confidence over the long-term. The legitimation function can be identified with concrete state activities that are generally opposed by capitalist elites, such as welfare entitlements, anti-trust legislation, redistributive income taxation, union protections, and governmental consultation with labor representatives regarding economic, fiscal, and labor market policies.

The necessity of simultaneously fulfilling mutually contradictory functions sets an outer boundary for the policy options available to state elites when confronted with economic or political crises. A capitalist state that blatantly exercises its repressive function to promote capital accumulation at the clear expense of the working classes undermines the basis of mass loyalty and support, that is, its legitimacy. However, continuing crises of the state and capitalism certainly raise the possibility that the existing capitalist state form might be reconstituted in non-liberal and non-democratic ways that allow it to continue promoting capital accumulation, while evading the restraints and restrictions of democratic legitimation.

The methodological basis for integrating the three major approaches to state theory, as opposed to seeing them as mutually exclusive theories, is found in the premise that Marxism is an empirical and historical social science, rather than an abstract philosophy. This means that a Marxist theory of the state must be able to conceptualize how the state develops and changes as it responds to periodic crises of accumulation and, consequently, Marxism is a *historical*, as well as an empirical, social science. However, historical and empirical analysis does not render theory irrelevant. Insofar as one can identify structures and functions of the capitalist state, it is implicit that there are commonalities among individual states that allow one to conceptualize political or state forms (e.g., Keynesian Welfare State). However, the exercise of the various state functions is not uniform in different historical periods or in all societies during the same period, and the size and prominence of any one of the three state functions (repression, accumulation, legitimation) must be analysed empirically.

Panitch anchors this claim in Volume 3 of *Capital*, where Marx (1998 [1894], 777–8) states that:

The specific economic form, in which unpaid surplus labour is pumped out of direct producers, determines the relationship of rulers and ruled, as it grows directly out of production itself and, in turn, reacts upon it as a determining element. Upon this, however, is founded the entire formation of the economic community which grows up out of the production relations themselves, thereby simultaneously its specific political form. It is always the direct

relationship of the owners of the conditions of production to the direct producers – a relation always naturally corresponding to a definite stage in the development of the methods of labour and thereby its social productivity – which reveals the innermost secret, the hidden basis of the entire social structure, and with it the political form of the relation of sovereignty and dependence, in short, the corresponding specific form of the state. This does not prevent the same economic basis – the same from the standpoint of its main conditions – due to innumerable different empirical circumstances, natural environment, racial relations, external historical influences, etc., from showing infinite variations and gradations in appearance, which can be ascertained only by analysis of the empirically given circumstances.

Similarly, in *The German Ideology*, where Marx and Engels (1976 [1846], 31) first worked out the method of historical materialism, they claim that

the premises from which we begin are not arbitrary ones, not dogmas, but real premises from which abstraction can only be made in the imagination. They are the real individuals, their activity, and the material conditions of their life, both those which they find already existing and those produced by their activity.

In fact, the word “empirical” appears 72 times in *The German Ideology* usually in references to empirical relations, empirical conditions, empirical reality, and empirical existence. A theoretically informed analysis of the state must be attuned to the specific configuration of individual state apparatuses (e.g., the high degree of decentralization in Canadian federalism as compared to the high degree of centralization in Mexican federalism or the existence of parliamentary versus presidential systems). It must also be attuned to the level of capitalist development in different social formations and the extent to which structural constraints set the boundaries of state policy (e.g., the level of state debt, dependence on foreign direct investment, the degree of democratization). An individual state’s ability to balance accumulation and legitimation will also depend on the relative class capacities of workers and capitalists (Lembcke 1988). A strong capitalist class and a weak working class may allow a state to pursue accumulation at the expense of legitimation for an indeterminate length of time.

Thus, theoretical concepts about state forms (structures) and state functions may guide the analysis of individual capitalist states, but such abstractions can never substitute for an empirical, institutional, and historical analysis of existing capitalist states.

CLYDE W. BARROW

References

- Alford, Robert and Roger Friedland. 1985. *Powers of Theory: Capitalism, the State, and Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Althusser, Louis. 1971. “Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses: Notes Towards an Investigation.” In *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, 127–86. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 1993. *Critical Theories of the State: Marxist, Neo-Marxist, Post-Marxist*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 2002. “The Miliband-Poulantzas Debate: An Intellectual History.” In *Paradigm Lost: Revising State Theory*, edited by Stanley Aronowitz and Peter Bratsis, 3–52. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 2016. *Toward a Critical Theory of States: The Poulantzas-Miliband Debate After Globalization*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Best, Michael H. and William Connolly. 1976. *The Politicized Economy*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Block, Fred. 1977. “The Ruling Class Does Not Rule: Notes on the Marxist Theory of the State.” *Socialist Revolution* 7: 6–28.
- Bridges, Amy Beth. 1974. “Nicos Poulantzas and the Marxist Theory of the State.” *Politics and Society* 4, no. 2 (June): 161–90.
- Carnoy, Martin. 1984. *The State and Political Theory*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Clarke, Simon, ed. 1991. *The State Debate*. New York: St. Martin’s Press.
- Easton, David. 1953. *The Political System: An Inquiry into the State of Political Science*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Gold, David A., Clarence Y. H. Lo, and Erik Olin Wright. 1975a. “Recent Developments in Marxist Theories of the Capitalist State, Part I.” *Monthly Review* 27: 29–43.
- Gold, David A., Clarence Y. H. Lo, and Erik Olin Wright. 1975b. “Recent Developments in Marxist Theories of the Capitalist State, Part II.” *Monthly Review* 27: 36–51.
- Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, edited by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. New York: International Publishers.
- Jessop, Bob. 1977. “Recent Theories of the Capitalist State.” *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 1: 353–72.

- Jessop, Bob. 1982. *The Capitalist State: Marxist Theories and Methods*. New York: New York University Press.
- Laclau, Ernesto. 1975. "The Specificity of the Political: The Poulantzas-Miliband Debate." *Economy and Society* 5: 87–110.
- Lindblom, Charles E. 1982. "The Market as Prison." *Journal of Politics* 44, no. 2 (May): 324–32.
- Mandel, Ernest. 1971. *The Marxist Theory of the State*. New York: Pathfinder Press.
- Marx, Karl. 1998 [1894]. "Capital: A Critique of Political Economy, Vol. 3: The Process of Capitalist Production as a Whole." In *Marx-Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 37. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. 1976. "The German Ideology." In *Marx Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 5, 19–549. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Miliband, Ralph. 1969. *The State in Capitalist Society*. New York: Basic Books.
- Miliband, Ralph. 1970. "The Capitalist State: Reply to Poulantzas." *New Left Review* 59 (January–February): 53–60.
- Miliband, Ralph. 1973. "Poulantzas and the Capitalist State." *New Left Review* 82: 83–92.
- Moore, Jr., Barrington. 1966. *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- O'Connor, James. 1973. *The Fiscal Crisis of the State*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Offe, Claus. 1975. "The Theory of the Capitalist State and the Problem of Policy Formation." In *Stress and Contradiction in Modern Capitalism*, edited by Leon Lindberg, 125–44. Lexington, MA, D.C. Heath.
- Panitch, Leo. 1977. *The Canadian State: Political Economy and Political Power*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Parsons, Talcott. 1951. *The Social System*. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. 1969. "The Problem of the Capitalist State." *New Left Review* 58 (November–December): 67–78.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. 1976. "The Capitalist State: A Reply to Miliband and Laclau." *New Left Review* 95 (January/February): 63–83.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. 1978. *Political Power and Social Classes*. London: Verso.
- Skocpol, Theda. 1979. *States and Social Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Skocpol, Theda. 1980. "Political Response to Capitalist Crisis: Neo-Marxist Theories of the State and the Case of the New Deal." *Politics and Society* 10: 155–201.
- Sweezy, Paul. 1942. *The Theory of Capitalist Development*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Weber, Max. 1946. "Politics as a Vocation." In *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, edited by Hans H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, 77–128. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

See also

Marxism; Nicos Poulantzas; Ralph Miliband; Claus Offe; James O'Connor

20. Transnational state

There is perhaps no concept more central to critical political science than the concept of the state. Over the last two decades, a group of scholars referred to as the global capitalism school has emerged, claiming that globalization is engendering the rise of a transnational capitalist class (TCC) supported by a transnational state apparatus (TNS) made up of nation-states, supranational institutions, and political and economic fora (Burbach & Robinson, 1999; Demirović, 2011; Harris, 2005, 2009, 2014, 2019; Liodakis, 2005, 2010, 2012, 2016; Robinson & Harris, 2000; Robinson, 2001, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2014, 2015, 2017, 2018, 2020a). One of the most prolific supporters of the global capitalism thesis – sociologist William I. Robinson (2004, 88) – defines the TNS as “an emerging network that comprises transformed and externally integrated national states, *together with* the supranational economic and political forums, and has not yet acquired any centralized institutional form.” Economic forums include organizations like the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank (WB), and the World Trade Organization (WTO), among others. Political forums include the Group of Seven (G7), the European Union (EU), the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), and similar organizations. The political economist George Liodakis (2010, 63) provides a similar definition, whereby the TNS:

is constituted by international organizations (UN, IMF, World Bank, WTO, OECD and so on), in close interconnection with the most powerful capitalist states and various international capitalist groupings (G7 or G20, World Economic Forum, the Trilateral, and so on) and plays a crucial and increasingly powerful role in forming the conditions for cooperation, the basic policies and the strategy for capital on a world level.

Sociologist Alex Demirović (2011, 55–6) provides another definition of what they call the transnational network state, which he defines as an emerging “apparatus that consists of an ensemble of state apparatuses on a local, national and international scale as well as formerly private organizations.” Like the above definitions, the transnational

network state has the specific function “of organizing the transnational element, developing policy and controlling the reproduction of the global accumulation process in the interest of this capital sector” (Demirović 2011, 53).

The concept of the TNS is a response to what the global capitalism school sees as a pervasive nation-state-centrism inherent to mainstream and critical political science approaches (e.g., Boli and Thomas 1999; Chase-Dunn 1998; Cox 1987; Gill 1991, 1993; Held 2013; Keohane and Nye 1972; Krasner 1983; Meyer et al. 1997; Murphy 2004). While these approaches recognize the ongoing globalization of capital and production relationships, the global capitalism school argues that they continue to view such phenomena as extensions of the nation-state system, rather than as part of a larger transformation of the global political economy. In contrast to orthodox approaches, the global capitalism school, in drawing from various strains of Marxist state theory, understands the state as a wider, abstract concept to describe and explain the institutionalization of class relationships on a global scale. As such, the different theories of the TNS typically rely on three central claims that tie the economic and the political together as two sides of the same coin.

The first claim is that production relations and capital accumulation have moved to the transnational level (meaning, increasingly across nation-state borders), and that the main function of the TNS is to reproduce capital accumulation at this level. As explained by Robinson (2004, 101):

The TNS is attempting to fulfill the functions for world capitalism that in earlier periods were fulfilled by what world-system and international-relations scholars refer to as a *hegemon*, or a dominant capitalist power that has the resources and the structural position to organize world capitalism as a whole and impose the rules, regulatory environment, and so on, that allows the system to function.

The second claim is that transnational capital accumulation has been driven by a transnational fraction of the capitalist class. Robinson (2004, 88) writes, for instance, that “the TCC has directly instrumentalized this TNS apparatus, exercising a form of TNS power through the multilayered configura-

tion of the TNS.” In response to criticism, Robinson (2014, 7) has since tempered this view, referring to this class as an emergent TCC that “operates across borders in numerous countries and has attempted to convert the whole world into a single unified field for global accumulation.” Liodakis (2005, 346) similarly writes that “a merger is taking shape among fractions of the ruling classes beyond national frontiers, crystallized in an international oligarchy or transnational capitalist class.” Likewise, Demirović (2011, 52–3) writes that the capitalist state “no longer organizes power blocs on a national level but acquires the contours of a state that organizes a transnational fraction of the ruling classes.”

The third claim is that the nation-state is a world-historic state form that is not disappearing, but in the process of an ongoing transformation:

The transnational state apparatus is condensed in autonomous political organizations, but primarily consists of a network of political units, apparatuses, individual departments, offices and committees, which formally are organized at the international level, or even still at the national state level, yet have the specific functions of organizing the transnational element, developing policy and controlling the reproduction of the global accumulation process in the interest of this capital sector (Demirović 2011, 53).

Liodakis (2010, 63) notes, similarly, that globalization does not imply “the elimination either of the nation-state or of the international system of states and their relations.” Robinson (2014, 67), as well, argues that “the nation-state is neither retaining primacy nor disappearing but becoming transformed and absorbed into this larger structure of a TNS.”

Critics of the transnational state

The TNS has been subject to significant criticism, with some critics even going so far as to claim that the TNS refers to a “a loose yet all-encompassing conglomeration of institutions, nation states, and other agencies,” and is thus, “not a state, transnational or otherwise” (Cammack 2009, 89) (see, e.g., symposia in the following journals: *Theory and Society* (2001), 30(2); *Science and Society* (2001–02), 65(4); *Critical Sociology* (2012), 38(3); *Historical Materialism* (2007), 15; *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*

(2006), 19(3)). The most common critiques of the TNS are: (1) that transnational forms of accumulation are not particularly new (Carroll 2012, 2013; Lacher 2006; Macartney and Shields 2011; McMichael 2001; Tabb 2009; Teschke and Lacher 2007; Wood 2002, 2007); (2) that TNS theory is based on a mechanical relationship with the rise of transnational capital (Bieler and Morton 2011/2014; Block 2001; Cammack 2009; Carroll 2012; Mann 2001; McMichael 2001; Tabb 2009); (3) that TNS theory makes a category error by including supranational forums as part of the TNS (Arrighi 2001; Mann 2001; van der Pijl 2001); (4) that TNS theory is based on an arbitrary periodization schema (Moore 2001; Wood 2007); and (5) that TNS theory makes the global into an abstract space, detached from the materiality of national forms of territorialization (Cammack 2009; Carroll 2012; McMichael 2001; Moore 2001). Critics also claim that the reality and extent of transnational capital is overstated (Anievas 2008; Panitch and Gindin 2012; Prashad 2012; Starrs 2017; Wood 2002), and that nation-states are not only the principal agents of globalization but remain powerful actors in the global economy (Barrow 2005; Panitch and Gindin 2012; van der Pijl 2001). Lastly, as Carroll and Sapinski (2016, 46) accurately point out, “in practice, the distinction between ‘national’ capitalists and ‘transnational’ capitalists is blurry,” making it difficult to determine which fraction of the capitalist class is responsible for these changes. As a result, most critics treat globalization as a new form of imperialism, with nation-states understood as an immutable feature of capitalism (Anievas 2008; Cammack 2009; Carroll 2012; Davidson 2012; Panitch and Gindin 2012; Sakellariopoulos 2018; Stokes 2005; Tabb 2009; Wood 2002, 2007).

Despite the attention that the global capitalism thesis has received, there remains significant confusion about the concept of the TNS. Some critics, for instance, believe that what is being argued is that a unified global state will replace the nation-state after it declines due to the onset of transnational accumulation (Davidson 2012; Lacher 2006; Panitch and Gindin 2012; Wood 2002). Given the definition of the TNS, this is clearly not what is being argued; however, it does bring to light the issue of how this transformation is taking place. As others point out, the exist-

ing explanation rests on a mechanical relationship between transnational accumulation and the transformation of the nation-state, alongside the larger problem that the TNS is immune to empirical falsification (Block 2001; Cammack 2009; Carroll 2012; Smith 2005; Tabb 2009). Furthermore, as more historically oriented critics note, capitalism emerged within the nation-state and international state system, meaning that “their interrelation is not structurally determined by any ‘logic of capital’” (Teschke and Lacher 2007, 565; see also Lacher 2006; Rosenberg 2002; Teschke 2003, 2006). Robinson (2014, 66) has responded to these charges by stating that social forms often change their function or content with the introduction of new circumstances: “even if the nation-state form of the political organization of world capitalism has its origins in feudal absolutist states and not in capitalist relations ... the fact is that this state form became a *capitalist* state form.” Questions remain, then: How do states change? How is the national state becoming a transnational one? How can we prove it?

From theory to empirical research

Such questions sit at the heart of recent scholarship which has attempted to move from TNS theory to empirical research. Robinson (2008, 2015) himself has applied his own theory of global capitalism to Latin American development, as well as the proliferation of state-owned enterprises. In both cases, he demonstrates the extent to which both are bound up with the rise of the TCC and TNS. Others have used modified versions of TNS theory to explore a variety of country- or region-specific themes, such as: US intervention in Colombia (Avilés 2008); the transformation of property relations in Canada (Garrod 2018); the relationship between global capitalism and paramilitarism in Haiti (Sprague-Silgado 2018); class relations in Australia and Oceania (Bramble 2016; Sprague-Silgado 2017); the transformation of the state as it relates to the export of Filipina workers (Rodriguez 2010); and, the transnationalization of state elites in Mexico (Salas Porras 2020). Others have used TNS theory to explore sectoral or governance-related aspects of global capitalism, such as: the relationship between the TNS and global infrastructure investment (Ougaard 2018); the transnationalization

of monetary authorities (Major 2013); the transformation of international law (Chimni 2010); the transnationalization of subnational states (Cannon and Jayasuriya 2016); and, the role of neoliberal think tanks in the U.S. (Neubauer 2012). In more recent works, Robinson (2019, 2020a, 2020b) characterizes the TNS as a global police state, and explores what the COVID-19 pandemic means for the restructuring of global capitalism. There is no doubt that debate over the TNS will continue as the global expansion of capitalism continues apace.

JOEL Z. GARROD

References

- Anievas, Alexander. 2008. “Theories of a Global State: A Critique.” *Historical Materialism* 16, no. 2: 190–206.
- Arrighi, Giovanni. 2001. “Global Capitalism and the Persistence of the North-South Divide.” *Science & Society* 65, no. 4: 469–76.
- Avilés, William. 2008. “US Intervention in Colombia: The Role of Transnational Relations.” *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 27, no. 3: 410–29.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 2005. “The Return of the State: Globalization, State Theory, and the New Imperialism.” *New Political Science* 27, no. 2: 123–45.
- Bieler, Andreas, and Adam David Morton. 2011. “The Will-O’-the-Wisp of the Transnational State.” *Journal of Australian Political Economy* 72 (March): 23.
- Block, Fred. 2001. “Using Social Theory to Leap over Historical Contingencies: A Comment on Robinson.” *Theory and Society* 30, no. 2: 215–21.
- Boli, John, and George M. Thomas. 1999. *Constructing World Culture: International Nongovernmental Organizations Since 1875*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bramble, Tom. 2016. “State, Capital, and Class Struggle in Australia: Reflections on the Global Capitalism Perspective.” In *Globalization and Transnational Capitalism in Asia and Oceania*, edited by Jeb Sprague, 269–84. New York: Routledge.
- Burbach, Roger, and William Robinson. 1999. “The Fin de Siecle Debate: Globalization as Epochal Shift.” *Science & Society* 63, no. 1: 10–39.
- Cammack, Paul. 2009. “Forget the Transnational State.” *Geopolitics, History, and International Relations* 1, no. 2: 79–97.
- Cannon, David, and Kanishka Jayasuriya. 2016. “The Regionalization of Capital in the Patchwork Economy and the Transnationalization of the Subnational State.” In *Globalization and*

- Transnational Capitalism in Asia and Oceania*, edited by Jeb Sprague, 285–300. New York: Routledge.
- Carroll, William. 2013. “Global Capitalism, American Empire, Collective Imperialism?” *Studies in Political Economy* 92: 93–100. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19187033.2013.11674977>
- Carroll, William K. 2012. “Global, Transnational, Regional, National: The Need for Nuance in Theorizing Global Capitalism.” *Critical Sociology* 38, no. 3: 365–71.
- Carroll, William K., and Jean Philippe Sapinski. 2016. “Neoliberalism and the Transnational Capitalist Class.” In *The Handbook of Neoliberalism*, edited by Kean Birch, Julie MacLeavy, and Simon Springer, 25–35. London: Routledge.
- Chase-Dunn, Christopher K. 1998. *Global Formation: Structures of the World-Economy*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Chimni, B. S. 2010. “Prolegomena to a Class Approach to International Law.” *European Journal of International Law* 21, no. 1: 57–82.
- Cox, Robert W. 1987. *Production, Power, and World Order: Social Forces in the Making of History*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Davidson, Neil. 2012. “The Necessity of Multiple Nation-States for Capital.” *Rethinking Marxism* 24, no. 1: 26–46.
- Demirović, Alex. 2011. “Materialist State Theory and the Transnationalization of the Capitalist State.” *Antipode* 43, no. 1: 38–59.
- Garrod, J. Z. 2018. “Imperialism or Global Capitalism? Some Reflections from Canada.” *Studies in Political Economy* 99, no. 3: 268–84.
- Gill, Stephen. 1991. *American Hegemony and the Trilateral Commission*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gill, Stephen. 1993. *Gramsci, Historical Materialism and International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harris, Jerry. 2005. “To Be Or Not To Be: The Nation-Centric World Order Under Globalization.” *Science & Society* 69, no. 3: 329–40.
- Harris, Jerry. 2009. “Statist Globalization in China, Russia and the Gulf States.” *Science & Society* 73, no. 1: 6–33.
- Harris, Jerry. 2014. “Transnational Capitalism and Class Formation.” *Science & Society* 78, no. 3: 312–33.
- Harris, Jerry. 2019. “The Future of Globalisation: Neo-Fascism or the Green New Deal.” *Race & Class* 61, no. 1: 3–25.
- Held, David. 2013. *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.
- Keohane, Robert O., and Joseph S. Nye Jr. 1972. *Transnational Relations and World Politics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Krasner, Stephen D., ed. 1983. *International Regimes*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Lacher, Hannes. 2006. *Beyond Globalization: Capitalism, Territoriality and the International Relations of Modernity*. London: Routledge.
- Liodakis, George. 2005. “The New Stage of Capitalist Development and the Prospects of Globalization.” *Science & Society* 69, no. 3: 341–66. www.jstor.org/stable/40404263
- Liodakis, George. 2010. *Totalitarian Capitalism and Beyond*. Burlington: Ashgate.
- Liodakis, George. 2012. “Crisis, the Emerging New Stage of Capitalism, and the Need of a Transnational Class Strategy for Social Emancipation.” *International Critical Thought* 2, no. 1: 7–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21598282.2012.660036>.
- Liodakis, George. 2016. “Recent Developments of Totalitarian Capitalism and the Evolving World Order: Some Implications for Social Movements.” *International Critical Thought* 6, no. 3: 342–58.
- Macartney, Huw, and Stuart Shields. 2011. “Finding Space in Critical IPE: A Scalar-Relational Approach.” *Journal of International Relations and Development* 14, no. 3: 375–83.
- Major, Aaron. 2013. “Transnational State Formation and the Global Politics of Austerity.” *Sociological Theory* 31, no. 1: 24–48.
- Mann, Michael. 2001. “Globalization Is (among Other Things) Transnational, Inter-National and American.” *Science & Society* 65, no. 4: 464–69.
- McMichael, Philip. 2001. “Revisiting the Question of the Transnational State: A Comment on William Robinson’s ‘Social Theory and Globalization.’” *Theory and Society* 30, no. 2: 201–10.
- Meyer, John W., John Boli, George M. Thomas, and Francisco O. Ramirez. 1997. “World Society and the Nation-State.” *American Journal of Sociology* 103, no. 1: 144–81.
- Moore, Jason. 2001. “Capital, Territory, and Hegemony over the Longue Durée.” *Science & Society* 65, no. 4: 476–84.
- Murphy, Craig N. 2004. *International Organization and Industrial Change: Global Governance Since 1850*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Neubauer, Robert J. 2012. “Dialogue, Monologue, or Something in Between? Neoliberal Think Tanks in the Americas.” *International Journal of Communication* 6: 2173–98.
- Ougaard, Morten. 2018. “The Transnational State and the Infrastructure Push.” *New Political Economy* 23, no. 1: 128–44.
- Panitch, Leo, and Sam Gindin. 2012. *The Making of Global Capitalism: The Political Economy of American Empire*. New York: Verso.
- Pijl, Kees Van Der. 2001. “Globalization or Class Society in Transition?” *Science & Society* 65, no. 4: 492–500.
- Prashad, V. 2012. “World on a Slope.” *Critical Sociology* 38, no. 3: 401–3.
- Robinson, William. 2003. “The Debate on

- Globalization." *Science & Society* 67, no. 3: 353–60.
- Robinson, William. 2005. "Global Capitalism: The New Transnationalism and the Folly of Conventional Thinking." *Science & Society* 69, no. 3: 316–28.
- Robinson, William, and Jerry Harris. 2000. "Towards A Global Ruling Class? Globalization and the Transnational Capitalist Class." *Science & Society* 64, no. 1: 11–54.
- Robinson, William I. 2001. "Global Capitalism and Nation-State-Centric Thinking – What We Don't See When We Do See Nation-States: Response to Critics." *Science & Society* 65, no. 4: 500–08.
- Robinson, William I. 2004. *A Theory of Global Capitalism: Transnational Production, Transnational Capitalists, and the Transnational State*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Robinson, William I. 2008. *Latin America and Global Capitalism: A Critical Globalization Perspective*. Johns Hopkins Studies in Globalization. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Robinson, William I. 2014. *Global Capitalism and the Crisis of Humanity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robinson, William I. 2015. "The Transnational State and the BRICS: A Global Capitalism Perspective." *Third World Quarterly* 36, no. 1: 1–21.
- Robinson, William I. 2018. *Into the Tempest: Essays on the New Global Capitalism*. Chicago: Haymarket Books.
- Robinson, William I. 2019. "Global Capitalist Crisis and Twenty-First Century Fascism: Beyond the Trump Hype." *Science & Society* 83, no. 2: 155–83.
- Robinson, William I. 2020a. *The Global Police State*. London: Pluto Press.
- Robinson, William I. 2020b. "Global Capitalism Post-Pandemic." *Race & Class* 62, no. 2: 3–13.
- Rodriguez, Robyn Magalit. 2010. *Migrants for Export: How the Philippine State Brokers Labor to the World*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Rosenberg, Justin. 2002. *The Follies of Globalisation Theory: Polemical Essays*. New York: Verso.
- Sakellaropoulos, Spyros. 2018. "The Theoretical Weakness of Theses Positing Emergence of a Transnational Bourgeoisie and a Transnational State: A Critique of the Views of William Robinson." *Journal of Labor and Society* 21, no. 4: 579–96.
- Salas Porras, Alejandra. 2020. "Transnational State Elites and the Neoliberal Project in Mexico." *New Global Studies* 15, no. 1: 23–46.
- Smith, Michael R. 2005. "A Theory of Global Capitalism: Production, Class, and State in a Transnational World (Review)." *The Canadian Journal of Sociology* 30, no. 3: 382–84.
- Sprague-Silgado, Jeb. 2017. "The Transnational Capitalist Class and Relations of Production in Asia and Oceania." In *Research in Political Economy*, edited by Masao Ishikura, Seongjin Jeong, and Minqi Li, 133–58. Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Sprague-Silgado, Jeb. 2018. "Global Capitalism, Haiti, and the Flexibilisation of Paramilitarism." *Third World Quarterly* 39, no. 4: 747–68.
- Starrs, Sean Kenji. 2017. "The Global Capitalism School Tested in Asia: Transnational Capitalist Class vs Taking the State Seriously." *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 47, no. 4: 641–58.
- Stokes, Doug. 2005. "The Heart of Empire? Theorising US Empire in an Era of Transnational Capitalism." *Third World Quarterly* 26, no. 2: 217–36.
- Tabb, William. 2009. "Globalization Today: At the Borders of Class and State Theory." *Perspectives on Global Development and Technology* 8, no. 2: 121–38.
- Teschke, Benno. 2003. *The Myth of 1648: Class, Geopolitics, and the Making of Modern International Relations*. New York: Verso.
- Teschke, Benno. 2006. "Debating 'The Myth of 1648': State Formation, the Interstate System and the Emergence of Capitalism in Europe – A Rejoinder." *International Politics* 43, no. 5: 531–73.
- Teschke, Benno, and Hannes Lacher. 2007. "The Changing 'Logics' of Capitalist Competition." *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 20, no. 4: 565–80.
- Wood, Ellen Meiksins. 2002. "Global Capital, National States." In *Historical Materialism and Globalization*, edited by Mark Rupert and Hazel Smith, 96–118. London: Routledge.
- Wood, Ellen Meiksins. 2007. "A Reply to Critics." *Historical Materialism* 15, no. 3: 143–70.

See also

What is the State?; Marxist Theory of the State I and II; William I. Robinson

21. Feminist theory and the state

Feminist theory is distinctive in its multifaceted approach to the state thanks to its focus on gendered power in all its forms – political, economic, social, and cultural. This is the main starting point for developing detailed awareness and understanding of the complexity and significance of feminist theory for the state across the academic fields of philosophy, politics, sociology, economics, international relations, geography, and globalization studies (Elshtain 1981; Randall and Waylen 1998; Walby 1990; Waring 1988; Peterson 1992; Massey 1994; Kofman and Youngs 2008). Feminist disciplinary and interdisciplinary perspectives include a focus on time/space frameworks, historically, in the present, and in connection with impacts on future possibilities. Feminist theory considers the state from the inside and outside as well as the roles of its boundaries in structures and patterns of gendered inequality and experience (Pettman 1996). This means that any *black box* notion of the state is contested and replaced by a comprehensive approach to political and social space that incorporates local and global settings, as well as their linkages and patterns of exchange (Youngs 1999).

This holistic framing includes individual and collective perspectives, as well as the effects of embodied aspects of identity in dominant masculinist and heteronormative contexts (Youngs 2000). In such ways, feminist analysis unpacks the many assumptions and abstractions associated with mainstream approaches to the state that have traditionally failed to examine its gendered realities and histories. As part of this process, it also critically interrogates any reductive sense of the state as a concept related purely to the public sphere, and undertakes instead to examine public/private dynamics, prioritizing what happens in the private spheres of social reproduction (family, care, and intimate relations) as much as the public ones of market-based production (employment and business) and politics (Peterson 2003). The political economy of time and value, and who gets to do what and for what kinds of reward, as well as the contrasting associated dominant gendered identities relating to them

are at play here (Youngs 2007). Masculinist power patterns concentrated in the public spaces of political and economic influence, and positioned hierarchically over the private spaces of domestic (home) and relational environments, are intrinsic to explanations of gendered inequalities.

Patriarchy

Patriarchy is a core concept in feminist analysis unpacking the historically embedded operation of male power, especially as it is institutionalized in dominant state, church, and family structures (Saadawi 1997; Enloe 2017; Pateman 2018). Its explanatory potency is substantially rooted in the connections it draws across systemic as well as role-based and identity factors. It points directly to the pervasive and enduring impacts of a human history dominated by masculinist framings of political, socio-economic, and cultural organization, as well as the different forms of knowledge, productivity, and creativity associated with them (Mies 2014; hooks 1982). The reinforcements across institutions, processes, and identities are crucial for understanding both how masculinist realities have been established and maintained, and why resistance to and transformation of them is profoundly challenging.

The patriarchal state as the pivotal political actor on the world stage is central not least because it is the prime guarantor of security and the only legitimate user of lethal force. While international law and the United Nations Security Council may be constraining influences at times on the use of this force, there is ultimately no entity above the state to control it. State-centered security is particular in aligning territorial boundaries with individual political identity through citizenship and its associated rights and protections. States control who belongs or does not belong within their territory, and who gains rights to reside for short or long periods, or to benefit from full citizenship rights.

This internal picture is also reflected beyond state boundaries, where citizenship is linked directly to passports or travel documents enabling movement across state boundaries within various rules and limitations related to the specific state travelled from and to. The state acts as a comprehensive container of individual political identity and security both within and beyond its bounda-

ries. Beyond state boundaries, state-to-state relations (friendly or hostile) impact how well that container will function in different circumstances. Individuals who are generally most insecure are those without passports or other state paperwork, so often the case for asylum seekers or refugees, or those who have been smuggled or trafficked between territories.

These factors highlight the extent to which the lives of people are controlled by states, and nowhere is this more graphic than in the area of states as legitimate users of force within and beyond their boundaries. Differing state systems of law and order include powers of detention and imprisonment, plus a range of forms of physical and capital punishment. Through defense and military structures, states can operate systems of national service or conscription with the ultimate outcome that individuals are compelled to sacrifice their lives in the interests of the state.

Warriors and fair maidens

A wealth of feminist analysis of the state has not surprisingly concentrated on the masculinist nature of defence and the military (Tickner 1993; Cohn 2012; Sjoberg 2013). It is another area where institutional and identity issues are equally in play and explored by feminist theory. Part of this exploration is the enmeshing of the patriarchal state with the patriarchal family structure. The protector role of the state is mirrored directly in the traditional and historically dominant role of the male patriarch as protector of the family. It can be argued that this fusing of the patriarchal state as protector of citizens and individual male patriarch as protector of family is the strongest and most deeply entrenched expression of masculinist domination.

The framing of male warriors and fair maidens is a vital part of the male-as-subject and woman-as-object dominant structure, along with the aligning of a range of mutually reinforcing oppositional qualities and positionalities with masculine versus feminine identities – strong/weak, protector/victim, active/passive, rational/emotional, objectivity/subjectivity, independence/dependence, invulnerability/vulnerability, courageous/cautious, to name a few key ones (Zalewski and Parpart 1998). This gendered infrastructure operates in interconnected ways across macro and micro levels of state, society, and

individual life. It fixes in continuing fashion not only how male and female, masculine and feminine, are perceived, but also fixes the contrasting roles and rewards they tend to be predominantly associated with, and have access to, as well as opportunities for or barriers to success. While these areas are fundamental to understanding patterns of male domination, they are also equally important for awareness of the blocks standing in the way of change, and the reasons why, if it does occur, it can be slow, fragile, and subject to reversal.

Part of the problem is the spatial politics influencing not only roles and activities, but also the places linked to them, which determine when gendered identities appear most in or out of place. While growing numbers of women hold powerful positions in the public sphere of politics, economics, and culture, the dominant and long-entrenched gender hierarchy associating the female gender with the private sphere of family and care still affects how they are perceived, judged, and related to, including the kinds of behavior expected from them.

The state determines and sustains dominant gender hierarchies in powerful ways and, equally importantly, acts as the key political and legal container for their complex operation across all areas of public and private life. Its role in the stability and naturalization of these hierarchies over long historical trajectories is distinctive, and is fully understood only through the dynamics of processes articulating, asserting, and reasserting gender binaries in different contexts and settings, and impacting lived realities and identities. This emphasizes time/space dimensions of how gendered power operates across all domains of life and how gendered identities are formed and sustained. Possibilities for transformation either at individual or societal levels are best considered with this in mind, with the strength of the patriarchal thread binding state and family contexts notable as a significant controlling force on the potential for and pace and persistence of any change.

The warriors and fair maidens framing has especially far-reaching significance. The warrior role is linked directly to the survival of the state – its preservation, defense, and security. It focuses on both inside and outside state boundaries in its sphere of activity and can be seen as evidence of the patriarchal thread binding state and family through its

function as protector of women and children. The time/space elements of this situation are explicit, with the warrior going off to battle and women and children generally left at home to await his safe return. The fact that increasing numbers of women have come to play the warrior role in recent history still leaves us a long way from overturning its prime part in defining masculine power.

The military's function in the fundamental protection of state security and sovereignty makes it a distinctive influence on the construction of male subjectivity in a wide sense. The warrior role and characteristics can be seen as foundational building blocks in this construction, and the most intransigent, bearing in mind the extent to which they are established as intrinsic to the very survival of the state and its citizens. The legitimate use of force unique to the state is articulated through masculine subjectivity in the warrior, but it goes much further than this construct. It contributes directly to the naturalization of violence as part of that subjectivity and is implicated in the most harmful effects of patriarchal power in the family and beyond, through gendered violence, including domestic violence, and coercive control (Marway and Widdows 2015).

Local/global

The protector dimension of the warrior concept is also influential in mapping spatial understandings of gendered identities in its static fixing of women and children at home, and the movement of men away to defend them, whether in conflicts within the state or beyond. Thinking geographically, it is easy to see how this positions women and children as most in place when at home and most out of place when beyond state boundaries. In such ways, the feminine is aligned with containment within the state in contrast to placing the masculine as much outside the state as within it. Extensive feminist work has explored the role of women as bearers of culture in this context, including as mothers, family carers, and homemakers (Yuval-Davis 1997). This is one among many signposts to the importance of embodied understandings of gender politics and identity, perhaps most graphically illustrated by the use of rape as a weapon of war, a form of territorial and cultural invasion through the violent abuse of the bodies of those who suffer as well as those who may be

born as a result. Gendered power is operating in a multidimensional manner here, including the resulting individual, familial, social, and cultural impacts, which can extend into the future long after a particular conflict.

In growing debates about local and global dynamics, time/space considerations have come increasingly to the fore in thinking about gender and the state. A range of issues has been highlighted related to women's mobility and vulnerabilities, for example, as sex workers, migrants, refugees, and trafficked individuals. Mainstream globalization analysis has focused on the expansion of interconnected systems of production and consumption across the world, and associated trading, service, and financial networks. Feminist analysis, while recognizing benefits to many women, including in professional, employment, and leadership areas, has examined the deficit side of globalization, where gendered inequalities have been extended, for example, in the cases of domestic and care work, and even more seriously, human trafficking and slavery, where women and children are most at risk. This analysis directs us to awareness that security is a complex and differentiated possibility, especially when state control is increasingly challenged by global market infrastructures and interdependencies, as well as international criminal networks. Feminist agendas have given substantial priority to human rights at local/global levels – the work of United Nations agencies, nongovernmental organizations, activist and community-building groups and networks (Hawkesworth 2018). These undertake a range of work addressing gender inequalities and women's and girls' rights within and beyond state borders, including different forms of research, advocacy, campaigning, fund-raising, and projects.

Partnerships are influential in joining global and local agendas, as well as funding and finding bottom-up solutions that empower communities for the long term, rather than the short term. The building and dissemination of knowledge about gender inequalities within states and in global terms is a key strategic element of local/global policy and practice work. This knowledge is frequently in tension with, or critical of, state conditions and priorities, but it is essential to raising international awareness and support for positive change. The era of digital feminism with the arrival of the internet, world wide web,

and social media has been a game-changer on this front. Gender issues have become far less hidden behind the patriarchal veils of mainstream state discourses where they had historically been largely marginalized by the state. Connectivity among women and entities supporting them has boomed; thus empowering network development across local/global settings, providing new visibility for their concerns, and enabling advocacy and campaigning activities at levels substantially scaled up from pre-digital times (Green and Adam 2001). Areas addressed by the activities include the use of digital tools and communication which extend gendered forms of harassment, violence, and oppression into the virtual environment (Youngs 2015).

Digital developments and the growth of the digital economy have added to pressures to tackle gender inequalities in science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM), which are traditionally male-dominated domains. One of the noteworthy facets of this challenge is its hegemonic significance because of the pivotal role of STEM in shaping the modern world and how it has developed in material, infrastructural, and economic terms (Harding 2008). STEM is as much about visioning the future as advancing knowledge and finding solutions for the major challenges of the day, notably the effects of climate change and mass humanitarian crises. Until women and girls are fully engaged in STEM, not just as researchers and workers, but as leaders and agenda setters in policy and practice, the heavily masculinist grip on this pursuit of knowledge, visioning, and problem solving will not be eased (Harding 1991). Research has made clear that STEM is a sphere where states and economies have failed most in terms of diversity and inclusion, which highlights STEM as an area requiring urgent positive change (World Economic Forum 2022). STEM knowledge and economic infrastructures are among the most entrenched and secure aspects of the patriarchal state and its gendered inequalities in the opening decades of the twenty-first century.

Other more positive developments prompting fresh critical thinking and reflection include a major step up in mainstream awareness of debates about gender, sexuality, and identity, which stress the pressing need for inclusionary, rather than exclusionary practices and cultures. The short form LGBTQIA2S+ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans-

gender, queer/questioning, intersex, asexual, two spirit, plus) is increasingly in use along with an accompanying focus on issues surrounding unconscious bias and its role in perpetuating prejudicial attitudes, assumptions, actions, and policies. The growth in same-sex parenting, civil partnerships, and marriages could not have been anticipated half a century earlier, and perhaps indicates some weakening of the historically embedded patriarchal state-family thread. Even if this turns out to be the case, there are no clear signs that wholesale transformation of the patriarchal state and state-system along lines reflecting feminist critiques is any kind of prospect in the near future.

GILLIAN YOUNGS

References

- Cohn, Carol. 2012. *Women and Wars: Contested Histories, Uncertain Futures*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Elshtain, Jean Bethke. 1981. *Public Man, Private Woman: Women in Social and Political Thought*, 2nd edn. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Enloe, Cynthia. 2017. *The Big Push: Exposing and Challenging the Persistence of Patriarchy*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.
- Green, Eileen, and Alison Adam, eds. 2001. *Virtual Gender: Technology, Consumption and Identity*. Routledge: London.
- Harding, Sandra. 1991. *Whose Science, Whose Questions, Thinking from Women's Lives?* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Harding, Sandra. 2008. *Sciences from Below: Feminisms, Postcolonialities and Modernities*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Hawkesworth, Mary E. 2018. *Globalization and Feminist Activism*, 2nd edn. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- hooks, bell. 1982. *Ain't I a Woman: Black Women and Feminism*. London: Pluto.
- Kofman, Eleonore, and Gillian Youngs, eds. 2008. *Globalization: Theory and Practice*, 3rd edn. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Marway, Herjeet, and Heather Widdows, eds. 2015. *Women and Violence: The Agency of Victims and Perpetrators*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Massey, Doreen. 1994. *Space, Place and Gender*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Mies, Maria. 2014. *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale: Women in the International Division of Labour*, 2nd edn. London: Zed Books.
- Pateman, Carole. 2018. *The Sexual Contract*, 30th anniversary edition. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Peterson, V. Spike, ed. 1992. *Gendered States: Feminist (Re)Visions of International Relations Theory*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

- Peterson, V. Spike. 2003. *A Critical Rewriting of Global Political Economy: Integrating Reproductive, Productive and Virtual Economies*. London: Routledge.
- Pettman, Jan Jindy. 1996. *Worlding Women: A Feminist International Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Randall, Vicky, and Georgina Waylen, eds. 1998. *Gender, Politics and the State*. London: Routledge.
- Saadawi, Nawal El. 1997. *The Nawal El Saadawi Reader*. London: Zed Books.
- Sjoberg, Laura. 2013. *Gendering Global Conflict*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Tickner, Judith Anne. 1993. *Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Walby, Sylvia. 1990. *Theorizing Patriarchy*. Oxford: Wiley.
- Waring, Marilyn. 1988. *If Women Counted: A New Feminist Economics*. London: Macmillan.
- World Economic Forum. 2022. *Global Gender Gap Report*. Geneva: World Economic Forum.
- Youngs, Gillian. 1999. *International Relations in a Global Age: A Conceptual Challenge*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Youngs, Gillian, ed. 2000. *Political Economy, Power and the Body: Global Perspectives*. London: Macmillan.
- Youngs, Gillian. 2007. *Global Political Economy in the Information Age: Power and Inequality*. London: Routledge.
- Youngs, Gillian. 2015. "Violence, Techno-Transcendence and Feminism: Thinking About Agency in the Digital Age." In *Women and Violence: The Agency of Victims and Perpetrators*, edited by Herjeet Marway and Heather Widdows, 162–77. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira. 1997. *Gender and Nation*. London: Sage.
- Zalewski, Marysia, and Jane Parpart, eds. 1998. *The "Man" Question in International Relations*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

See also

Gender; Marriage Equality; Migration; *Feminist Review*; *Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy*; *International Journal of Feminist Politics*

22. Theories of imperialism and empire

The term “imperialism” has been employed to describe a diverse range of economic, political, cultural, and linguistic phenomena, with a wide range of historical applicability. From the Persian Empire of antiquity to contemporary American military operations in the Middle East, from China’s ongoing economic penetration of Africa to the old Soviet domination of Eastern Europe, passing through any real or perceived form of “hierarchy” and “privilege,” everything is seemingly pertinent to the subject. But this use of imperialism as shorthand for any form of imposition throughout history actually deprives it of its theoretical and political purchase. Used in this way, “imperialism” can easily be brushed off as an unavoidable, if regrettable secretion of human nature or of the human will to power.

The term made its entrance onto the world stage in the second half of the nineteenth century. Much like “empire” – a term that is commonly treated as synonymous – in this case, what began as a matter of domestic policy became projected onto the international arena. “Empire” (derived from the Latin “imperium”) was used by the ancient Romans to denote the ability to command or to rule at home, specifically, to make laws and to wage wars. “Imperialism” was initially used to describe the policies of the French Emperor Napoleon III in the 1860s, but it gradually came to be associated with the broader surge of colonial acquisitions by European states. By the 1890s, both supporters and opponents of colonial expansion routinely employed the term “imperialism” in their debates over the direction of their societies, and, indeed, the world. The term referred to the frenzied struggle that had broken out for a share of the rapidly shrinking pool of territories available for colonial control in the late nineteenth century. The division of what was left of the world, but also the increasingly insistent claims for a more “equitable” re-division in accordance with a changing relation of forces, at this stage took place largely, though not entirely, in the field of diplomacy. This struggle involved the British hegemon and its historic rival, France, but

also industrialized upstarts (the Germans, Japanese, and Americans), fading old players (the Spanish and Portuguese), and, somewhat incongruously, even the Belgians and the Italians.

However, as the most astute observers of the day insisted, in spite of certain superficial similarities these were not like the vulgar empires of the past, at least not in an economic sense. What had already been an implicit, if often undetected, connection between the domestic and international order came to be the subject of conscious scrutiny. For the first time, intellectuals of different political persuasions began to put into focus how the staggering economic developments in the advanced countries made the drive to acquire reliable sources of raw materials and secure markets an absolute necessity. The economic logic behind the new era of imperialism, however, was not merely a desiccated matter of efficiency.

During this heyday, men like Cecil Rhodes proudly wore the mantle of “imperialists,” not just on account of the immense wealth that was being accumulated in the enterprise, but also because imperialism promised a solution to the problem of maintaining social order at home. As Rhodes argued, the only way to deal with a burgeoning working class in England was to ensure high rates of profits that would trickle down to them, as well as to acquire new territories to which they could migrate. Moreover, the benefits of imperialism would extend not just to the great unwashed at home, but more broadly still, as it would bring “civilization” into the farthest and darkest corners of the world.

However, this happy picture of what imperialism meant was never quite as stable as its supporters presented it. While early liberal opponents of imperialism like the scholar J.A. Hobson (2018 [1902]) began to expose problems with the imperialist enterprise, it was the rise of the international socialist movement that set the stage for a decisive turn in the way imperialism was understood and used in the broader political discourse. As the great powers of the day hurtled into what would come to be known as the First World War, the Bolshevik leader Vladimir Lenin (2002 [1917]) wrote a short, explosive pamphlet which laid out the origins, trajectory, and the essentially undemocratic and exploitative nature of imperialism. Here the link between the domestic and the international,

the economic and the political, already diagnosed by Hobson, was developed in a more forceful manner. The propulsive economic development associated with capitalism was giving rise not just to the well-documented inequities in the advanced countries, but also, and systematically, to conquest, subjugation, and war on an international scale. The ongoing predatory integration of all corners of the world was then not an atavistic evil, but a distinctly modern phenomenon bound up with the other remarkable transformations characteristic of the age. Moreover, it was not at bottom a misguided set of policies with lamentable human consequences, but a full-fledged economic and political system on a global scale that had to be confronted as such.

Lenin's argument proved to be persuasive for at least two reasons. One, in spite of the efforts to present the enterprise as civilizing and mutually beneficial, the reality of life for the vast majority of the colonized populations remained a scathing and irrefutable indictment of imperialism. Two, despite their rhetorical commitment to the "right to self-determination," the victors of the "war to end all wars" not only divided up the remains of the Ottoman empire amongst themselves, but also justified their continued right to colonial rule through the mandate system of the new League of Nations. In other words, they maintained the old imperialist system through new forms, which set the stage for future conflicts.

Over the course of the next two decades, as nationalist movements around the world became more and more prominent, and as the Great Powers hurtled towards another catastrophic global conflict, the claim that imperialism was in any way beneficial to the colonized became impossible to sustain. The decolonization of the Third World, beginning after World War II, seemed to confirm this prognosis. Yet this process, which in some instances took the form of an orderly transfer of power between governments, posed new questions from the standpoint of the continuing relevance of imperialism. On the one hand, the fall of the empires and the formal political independence of the former colonies appeared to be a landmark achievement. On the other hand, exploitation, subjugation, and inequality, to say nothing of conflict and war, could hardly be said to have come to an end on the international arena. In this context,

the use of the term "imperialism," which had found an obvious and direct application in the policies that had characterized the relationship between the colonizers and the colonized, began to subside and give way to a different kind of vocabulary.

The criticism of lingering forms of hierarchy and inequality began to be expressed more in the cultural vein, particularly under the influence of new moods and theories. "Orientalism," for instance, framed the question of the historical encounter between the West and the rest of the world in terms best understood through the prism of cultural studies, rather than politics and economics (Said 1978). Imperialism had after all come to be associated with Marxist politics, and, by extension, with the Soviet Union, particularly in the Western academy. By the 1970s, though political restlessness and discomfort with capitalism at home and abroad had far from disappeared, a wide layer of "leftist" and formerly "leftist" intellectuals no longer took seriously the notion that a new kind of society was being built behind the iron curtain. Many were keen to point out that if the term imperialism remained useful, it should be applied first and foremost to the relation between the Soviet Union and its satellites. Imperialism, as a concept and as a shorthand for a certain way to understand the world, was a casualty of this intellectual and political process.

The decline in the usage of the term became precipitous in the aftermath of the collapse of the Soviet Union. The end of the Cold War, and the declaration of a "new world order," set the stage for claims about the possibilities, if not yet the actuality, of an epoch that would no longer be governed by the ever-present competition and conflict amongst Great Powers. Within a decade, however, the situation began to change dramatically. Imperialism was suddenly back in fashion, and in a way that it had not been for well-over half a century. In what appeared to be a carefully timed blitzkrieg of publications, a group of scholars and policymakers on both sides of the Atlantic began making the claim that imperialism had been given a bad rap by leftists, left-leaning nationalists, and ivory tower academics who were unwilling to recognize the hard realities of the past century. Ensnconed in well-funded think-tanks, high-level government positions, and Ivy-league academic institutions, the

individuals making up this group – including Max Boot (2002), Sebastian Mallaby (2002), Niall Ferguson (2004), and Deepak Lal (2004) – were quite different in terms of the levels of sophistication they brought to their argument, their public presence, political influence, and telegenic personality. What united them was the claim that the imperialism practiced by liberal states (Britain in the past, and the United States in the present) was not just beneficial, but actually necessary to maintain peace and stability in the world. This, they argued, was particularly true given the large number of failed and failing states in the formerly colonized regions of the world. Not coincidentally, this area included Afghanistan and Iraq, the two countries invaded by the United States in the aftermath of the attacks of September 11, 2001. The professional fortunes of the neo-imperialists have waned in the decade since the inaugural salvos of operations “Enduring Freedom” and “Iraqi Freedom.” Their fate to some extent is a measure of the popular response to the character, duration, and costs of the wars. But their arguments about the relevance of imperialism continue to resonate, though perhaps not in the way they intended at the time.

Theorizing imperialism

The history of the term “imperialism” follows in its fortune and usage the history of the actual phenomenon itself. However, Establishment Political Science has largely tended to ignore the implications of this crucial point, which resulted in the dominance of two major tendencies in theorizing imperialism – one, emphasizing the atavistic character of the violent struggles over territory and resources; and the other, highlighting the novelty of the present. We provide a quick sketch of these before presenting the perspective we believe captures the true historical, analytical, and political essence of imperialism.

Violence and domination can hardly be said to be a modern innovation. In popular thinking, as well as influential academic accounts, these features are taken to be permanently entrenched, if regrettable traits of human nature. Once “man’s incessant struggle for existence” crosses a certain threshold in terms of its geographical scale and ambition, it becomes possible to speak of empires, which carry out violence and domination

in a more organized manner. An empire conquers, occupies, imposes its will and law on its subjects, fends off rivals – until it falls, and is eventually replaced by another empire. From this standpoint, if such a thing as imperialism can be said to exist, it is simply the process or policy of maintaining a long and homogeneous history of empires, from the Sumerians to the modern era (Doyle 1986).

Writing at the end of World War I, the influential economist Joseph Schumpeter theorized imperialism along these lines. To those who argued that World War I was the product of specific social interests, organized in a new and explosive political and economic configuration, Schumpeter answered that the “will to war” was effectively a historical constant. The “real basis of aggressiveness” turned out to be “aggressiveness in itself.” Schumpeter argued that imperialism “is the object-less disposition of a state to expansion by force without assigned limits” (Schumpeter 1955, 6). However, towards the end of the same text, as if seized by a sudden bout of historical sensitivity, Schumpeter claimed that imperialism was in fact a legacy of the old feudal monarchical state system for the intrinsic logic of capitalism would have never allowed such a war as World War I. The “*pacifique bourgeoisie*” inherited “the war machine, its social atmosphere, and the martial will” from the nobility and stumbled into a political alliance with it. Though not spelled out, the natural conclusion of Schumpeter’s argument was that the dissolution of the regrettable alliance – manifested most tangibly in the de-colonization process – would then lead to the end of imperialism. But this has been a leap too far for most scholars, who have been more open to the idea that imperialism continues to shape global politics, albeit in different form.

The aftermath of World War II witnessed the end of colonial empires, the emergence of the United States as the sole, hegemonic capitalist power, and the onset of the Cold War. The U.S.S.R., the only rival to the global leadership claimed by the United States, carried out its own undoubtedly predatory foreign policy leading many scholars to make what is essentially a false equivalence between “American and Soviet imperialism.” The situation changed dramatically in the last decade of the twentieth century, with the collapse of the Soviet Union and the proclamation of a “new world order,” one in which

the promises of a peaceful American-led world could finally be fulfilled. Without succumbing to the “end of history” euphoria (Fukuyama 1992), some theorists argued that imperialism was fundamentally different in the contemporary period. It had now taken the form of a world capitalist system, which despite some “instabilities, and even crises” continued to thrive under the vigilant ministrations of the unrivaled, informal American empire (Panitch and Gindin 2012).

Others went even further with the claim of novelty, insisting that “imperialism was over” and that it had now been replaced by an entirely different form of decentered Empire (Hardt and Negri 2000, xiv). Hardt and Negri (2000, 224–5) argued that imperialism was “a system designed to serve the needs and further the interests of capital in its phase of global conquest” and, as such, it was connected to modern forms of territorial sovereignty. Hardt and Negri (2000, 333) further claimed that this type of imperialism had been undermined and replaced by “Empire” – a “decentered and de-territorializing apparatus of rule that incorporates the entire global realm within its open, expanding frontiers.” Drawing on a smorgasbord of traditions and concepts – including French post-structuralism and Italian autonomism, Baruch Spinoza, Karl Marx, Immanuel Kant and Gilles Deleuze – *Empire* seemed to capture a particular *zeitgeist* – winning plaudits and becoming an academic sensation. The fevered excitement about *Empire*, however, ultimately was a storm in a teacup. While briefly productive of numerous academic roundtables and special journal issues, the arguments presented by Hardt and Negri – whether it was about an amorphous network of nodal power that strangely enough was embodied only in the United States, or the notion of a virtual economy that had overtaken the “real” economy – soon ran aground on the shoals of real events, particularly the American proclamation of an open-ended “War on Terror.” Michael Hardt (2006) attempted a convoluted explanation that blamed the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq on “American imperialism,” and argued that the failure of those wars was a product of American policy-makers’ inability to recognize that “imperialism and its methods were losing their effectiveness.” While still clinging to the notion that “a new form of global domination” was emerging, Hardt’s essay

can basically be seen as a sign of the times – a growing acknowledgment that imperialism was far from over in the twenty-first century.

Imperialism: past and present

Imperialism should be understood as a modern, historically specific, and still evolving relationship between a series of political and economic developments (Saccarelli and Varadarajan 2015). Imperialism emerged in the late-nineteenth century and has since then manifested itself in the interactions amongst nation-states, ranging from the seemingly amicable (deliberations, agreements, and treaties) to the openly inimical (localized clashes, devastating global wars). The language employed by nation-states to describe and justify these interactions has varied over the centuries. It ranges from the overt racism of the late-nineteenth century captured by the “White Man’s Burden” to the Preamble of the United Nations Charter with its uplifting language about “equal rights of men and women of nations large and small.” The form that imperialism has taken over time has also changed from the unapologetic drive towards territorial acquisitions in its early history to less direct mechanisms of political control in the present time. However, the fundamental logic underlying imperialism has remained unaltered since its emergence – a logic that is tied to the development of capitalism.

The insistence of the well-regarded liberal thinker, J.A. Hobson (1902), on revealing the “economic taproot of imperialism” was picked up by Marxist theoreticians of the age, including Rudolf Hilferding (1981) and Rosa Luxemburg (1951), who systematically explored this question. Unlike Hilferding and Luxemburg, whose works constitute a comprehensive theoretical analysis, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin’s *Imperialism* (written in early 1916, and first published in mid-1917) was intended as a political pamphlet. Published amidst the intensification of the revolutionary struggle in Russia, the goal of this tract was straightforward: to expose the roots of the Great War at that moment and to explain why the capitalist mode of production was an unstable and unsustainable system for the vast majority of the world’s population. Much like Hobson, Lenin argued that to understand the major political issues of the day, one needed to look at the development of capitalism and pay particular attention to

the role of financial capital. Unlike Hobson, however, Lenin came to the conclusion that these developments were an essential aspect of the capitalist mode of production and, thus, could not be rolled back or separated from it. Far from being an issue of specific national policies, imperialism was a systemic feature of capitalism. It was the inner logic of the capitalist mode of production that led to imperialism and, as such, the fate of the former was inextricably connected to the latter. In fact, imperialism *was*, in Lenin's definition, capitalism at a particular stage of its development.

The fact that capitalism on a global scale has not remained static and has arguably demonstrated remarkable resilience despite generating crisis after crisis has led many scholars on the academic left to argue that Lenin's theory needs to be revised and updated for the twenty-first century. For example, in *The New Imperialism* (2003), David Harvey suggests that we now need to conceptualize geopolitics (the territorial logic) as distinct from capitalism (the economic logic) so that one might theorize imperialism as a relationship between the two logics. Harvey's argument is important because it provides an account of post-World War II developments that highlights the reality of conflict in a complex, contradictory world seemingly shaped by American hegemony. However, with its call for a "new New Deal," Harvey's (2003) analysis ultimately drifts in a direction that is fundamentally antithetical to the politics motivating the Marxist analysis and critique of imperialism.

Lenin's analysis of the capitalist system was that having morphed into imperialism, and notwithstanding periods of seeming peace and many instances of cooperation, the world order would be defined by the ever-present threat and periodic manifestations of major conflicts amongst the various state actors. The political conclusion, equally important from Lenin's standpoint, was that the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism was the only way to secure meaningful peace, while setting the stage for a fundamental transformation of global politics beyond the nation-state system. At the time of this writing, when the "old" explosive contradictions are back with a vengeance, and are compounded by new ones, including a global

pandemic that has become the flashpoint for international tensions, rather than scientific cooperation – it is this argument that deserves a closer look and theoretical refinement at the present time.

EMANUELE SACCARELLI AND LATHA
VARADARAJAN

References

- Boot, Max. 2002. *The Savage Wars for Peace: Small Wars and the Rise of American Power*. New York: Basic Books.
- Doyle, Michael. 1986. *Empires*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Ferguson, Niall. 2004. *Colossus: The Price of America's Empire*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 1992. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press.
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2000. *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hardt, Michael. 2006. "From Imperialism to Empire." *The Nation*, July 31. Available at www.thenation.com/article/archive/imperialism-empire/ (accessed April 22, 2023).
- Harvey, David. 2006. *The New Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hilferding, Rudolf. 1981 [1910]. *Finance Capital: A Study of the Latest Phase of Capitalist Development*, edited by Tom Bottomore. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Hobson, John A. 2018 [1902]. *Imperialism: A Study*. London: Routledge.
- Lal, Dipak. 2004. In *Praise of Empires: Globalization and Order*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Lenin, V.I. 2002 [1917]. *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*. New York: International Publishers.
- Luxemburg, Rosa. 1951 [1913]. *The Accumulation of Capital*, edited by W. Stark. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Mallaby, Sebastian. 2002. "The Reluctant Imperialist: Terrorism, Failed States and the Case for an American Empire." *Foreign Affairs* Vol. 81 (2): 2–7.
- Panitch, Leo and Sam Gindin. 2012. *The Making of Global Capitalism: The Political Economy of American Empire*. London: Verso.
- Saccarelli, Emanuele and Latha Varadarajan. 2015. *Imperialism Past and Present*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Said, Edward W. 1978. *Orientalism*, 1st edition. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Schumpeter, Joseph A. 1955 [1918]. *Imperialism and Social Classes; Two Essays*, translated by Heinz Norden. New York: Meridian Books.

23. World-systems analysis

By the mid-1960s, after an impressive wave of decolonization, many of Africa's newly independent states faced problems of public debt and governance. The prevailing social scientific view was that leadership and institutional design were to blame for these problems. According to modernization theorists, increased international trade linkages could help new nations establish strong economies and democratic institutions (So 1990). Such scholars believed that the success or failure of states and their economies hinged on the actions of governments. Yet from the perspective of the Global South, the world's great powers simply continued to pursue their strategic and economic interests into the postcolonial era. Tanzania's president, Julius Nyerere, bluntly called Western actions during this time the second scramble for Africa (Williams 2020, 56).

Immanuel Wallerstein (2005, 2017), whose research on Africa in the 1950s and 1960s chronicled the hopes and disappointments of independence, thought that analyses of development ought to include Western meddling. From colonial administration to national liberation to postcolonial governance, African development was never independent of the Global North. Even state boundaries were determined by the great powers. Frantz Fanon summarized the Western attitude well when, on one occasion, he said to Wallerstein: "Americans do not engage in dialogue; ... [they] speak monologues" (Wallerstein 2009, 118). The same might be said of mainstream visions of development in political science, first, under the label of modernization and then as globalization (Roberts and Hite 2000). Today, proponents of the latter, also with the assumption that development occurs at the national level, advise that states quickly integrate into the world-economy, which presumably will spur economic and political development (Roberts and Hite 2000).

Wallerstein set out to formulate a theory of development for the world's "new" nations. He thought that Europe's "old" nations might serve as a kind of model if one studied their sixteenth-century origins. With the benefit of history, he reasoned, one could learn from the youthful experiences and developmental

trajectories of European national states. Yet, by the early 1970s, Wallerstein rejected the premise of his study. He realized that postcolonial states could not follow the paths of the great powers that developed in competition only with one another. Rather than national development, Wallerstein believed one ought to consider the development of the entire capitalist system, which went beyond domestic politics to include political and economic relations among states (Wallerstein 2004a, 87–8).

Informed by Fanon's ideas, in addition to those of Fernand Braudel and Karl Polanyi, Wallerstein in the mid-1970s inaugurated a new tradition called world-systems analysis (WSA) (1974a, b). In place of the state, Wallerstein's new unit of analysis was the world-system. He hyphenated the term to mark that the system was a self-contained world, not a system that necessarily encompassed the globe (Wallerstein 2004b, 16–17). The modern world-system began in Europe and the Americas over the "long" sixteenth century, c. 1450–c. 1640 (Wallerstein 1974a, 63, 270). After a period of consolidation in the seventeenth century, it expanded through imperialism in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Wallerstein 1980, 1989). It was only in this latter period that the system covered the Earth.

World-systems analysis was premised on the idea that all systems had lives. Whether a small kin-based social group, a large empire, or the capitalist interstate system, all systems have a birth, a life, and a death. The same holds true for natural systems, whereby routine functions over time tend to produce disorder (or entropy). Unable to restore equilibrium, a system in crisis – whether natural or social – behaves in unpredictable ways. Wallerstein made this connection to the natural world after meeting Ilya Prigogine, who in 1977 won the Nobel Prize in Chemistry (Prigogine 1997; Williams 2020, 101–04).

The tradition of world-systems analysis turned into a global knowledge movement. Its practitioners often collaborated at a distance and met up at conferences. Early leading figures included "The Gang of Four": Samir Amin, Giovanni Arrighi, Andre Gunder Frank, and Wallerstein, who in the 1970s and 1980s said that he agreed with his three comrades a remarkable 80 percent of the time (Wallerstein 2000, xi–xii; Amin et al. 1982, 1990). While its appeal in the

United States would ebb and flow over the decades (a sign perhaps of American social science's proximity to power), WSA's global reach would increase over time. In fact, today all 500 of Wallerstein's "Commentaries" on current events, released bi-weekly from 1998 to 2019, have been translated into Mandarin Chinese.

Wallerstein and fellow social scientists identified several types of world-systems. *World-economies* have various political units contained within one economic structure. The current world-system, the capitalist world-economy, has a singular capitalist economy that contains multiple nation-states (Wallerstein 1974a, 348–9). The states compete for power but cannot control the entire system. Still, the modern world-system is not an economically determinist system, however defined. Scholars in international relations have debated whether the modern world was primarily a political interstate system or an economic system of global capitalism. Yet WSA never saw two "logics" in competition; instead, it always viewed nation-states and capitalism as a part of one relational process (Chase-Dunn 1981).

Historically, world-economies have been short-lived. They have usually transformed into *world-empires* that, like the Roman empire, were large, tribute-based systems united by a single governing force and economic system. Smaller, *kin-based world-systems* ranged from indigenous social groupings (with impermanent leadership) to hierarchical chiefdoms (Chase-Dunn and Lerro 2014; Carneiro, Grinin, and Korotayev 2017).

With popularity, however, came new perspectives on world-systems analysis. While Wallerstein wrote about modernity, others such as Christopher Chase-Dunn sought to draw conclusions using comparative history. According to his *evolutionary world-systems* perspective, social formations have slowly merged over the ages, like streams flowing into rivers and lakes: small tribes became large chiefdoms, then empires, and then the relatively recent capitalist world-economy (Chase-Dunn and Lerro 2014, 78). This vision of world politics recognizes the uniqueness of systems yet makes large-scale comparisons to draw conclusions about the present (Chase-Dunn and Hall 1997; Chase-Dunn et al. 2015). Some in this evolutionary framework prioritize the role of civilizations

(Sanderson 1995; Wilkinson 1994). Many others also identify with the tradition of *cliodynamics*, which stresses mathematical models of historical change (Turchin and Gavrillets 2009).

Another variation on WSA was formulated by Andre Gunder Frank. Though his views initially aligned with that of his friend Wallerstein, Frank came to believe that the entire earth was a single system. He adopted the label of *world system history*, unhyphenated, because he and others, such as Janet Abu-Lughod and Robert Denemark, saw numerous interconnections across the globe stretching back as far as 5,000 years (Abu-Lughod 1989; Frank 1990, 1998; Denemark 1999). Capital, of course, became central to life in the modern world, but they argued the shift was less dramatic than Wallerstein believed. Frank's earlier writings on colonial legacies of dependency in Latin America (e.g., Frank 1969) had inspired Wallerstein. Yet, by the 1990s, the two thinkers substantially differed on the meanings of "world," "system," and, for that matter, "capitalism."

Most versions of WSA agree that modern capitalism, a world-economic system, requires actors to endlessly accumulate capital, which is defined as stored value (Williams 2020, 76 and 202en61). Capitalism is not identified with wage labor because owner-producers often favor a mix of waged and non-waged laborers (Wallerstein 1980). Furthermore, most scholars in WSA agree that the capitalist world-economy is characterized by inequality. There exists a well-off *core*, an in-between *semiperiphery*, and an exploited *periphery*, divisions that mirror those of domestic classes. The development of the world-system was one interrelated process: through imperialism and its successors, the well-being of the core (such as North America and West Europe) was predicated on the immiseration of the periphery (which today is much of the Global South). The all-important semiperiphery is between the others, such as the BRICS nations (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa). Though functionally an economic intermediary, the semiperiphery has also historically served as a brake on revolutionary activity in the periphery.

Core powers also sought to maintain support for the world-system. In response to democratic demands symbolized by 1789,

the year of the French Revolution and the second American republic, domestic elites (and the core generally) embraced the principles of liberalism. To them, liberalism meant the promise of better wages and political power for groups they had excluded from democratic processes, domestically and in the world. The promise, however, was that democratic inclusion would be realized over generations. Liberal pledges of equality, paradoxically, helped preserve inequality in the world-system (Wallerstein 2011a). For this reason, elites across the core worried about popular backlash. In WSA, acts of resistance against the established order are called *anti-systemic movements* (Arrighi et al. 1989).

Over its lifespan, the modern world-system has exhibited reasonably predictable patterns of behavior called *cyclical rhythms* (that is, the ups and downs of the system), such as the rise and fall of hegemonic powers and economic long waves. The latter is the idea that there are periods of faster and slower growth, which Wallerstein likened to the world-system taking in a breath and then letting it out (Williams 2020, 105; Komlosy 2019). Likewise, there are periods of great power dominance within the world-system. Periods of *hegemony*, rare and brief, have included the Dutch (1625–72), the British (1815–73), and the Americans (1945–67). These moments of unrivaled great power dominance occur at the peak of an economic cycle, usually after a major war, and reorder governing institutions in the world-system (Arrighi 2010; Arrighi and Silver 1999; Wallerstein 1989).

As Prigogine anticipated, the normal operations of a world-system eventually cause its undoing. The cyclical rhythms of capitalism have produced long-term outcomes called *secular trends*, such as mechanization, urbanization, population growth, ecological destruction, the commodification of previously non-commodified goods, and the geographic expansion of the world-system (Chase-Dunn 1998, 51–3; Wallerstein 2001, 260–61). Expansion is perhaps most significant for the world-economy's contemporary crisis. When confronted with the pressures of ecological degradation and laborers' demands, the system would expand to new areas, thus relieving internal pressures (Wallerstein 2013). By the late nineteenth century, however, the capitalist world-economy had run out of geographic room to grow. It could

only partially resolve contradictions through extra-territorial means, such as technological innovation and by creating new commodities. Indeed, as Wallerstein (1995, 16) put it, capitalism demands the "commodification of everything."

World-systems analysis remains confident in the end of capitalism, but not in predicting its replacement. Movements of systemic demise are opportunities for egalitarians, just as they are for those seeking exploitative class relations. For this reason, Wallerstein believed twenty-first century activism was crucially important for creating a better world. He put the odds of postcapitalist egalitarianism at fifty-fifty (Williams 2020, 210en71).

In addition to sociology, international relations, and political economy, world-systems analysis in the twenty-first century can be found in cultural studies (Palumbo-Liu et al. 2011), social movement studies (Buechler 2000; Smith 2008), intellectual history and biography (Derluguian 2005; Harris and McQuade 2015; Williams 2020), policy studies (Winders 2009), and environmental history (Hornborg et al. 2007; Patel and Moore 2017). Some environmentalists, such as Jason W. Moore, consider their perspective of *world-ecology* to be a departure from classical WSA. Though WSA was always sensitive to environmental change (Moore 2003), this variation seeks greater unity between the social and the environmental; the tradition of world-ecology regards capitalism as a means of organizing nature (Moore 2015).

The diversity of world-systems analysis reflects its appeal and transdisciplinary character. Scholarly traditions usually depart from the vision of their founders, of which WSA is no exception, but Wallerstein also intended for it to spread far beyond the field of political sociology in which he was trained. Like the study of religion or literature, he thought world-systems analysis should be rooted in many humanistic and social scientific disciplines (Wallerstein 2011b), which themselves are not natural divisions but the product of universities and their history (Wallerstein 1999). Today, in addition to being a critical perspective on politics, world-systems analysis is a home for critical scholars in many fields. Yet its greatest advantage is not that it is a political movement for equality, but that it is a knowledge movement for accuracy.

GREGORY P. WILLIAMS

References

- Abu-Lughod, Janet. 1989. *Before European Hegemony: The World System A.D. 1250–1350*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Amin, Samir, Giovanni Arrighi, Andre Gunder Frank, and Immanuel Wallerstein. 1982. *Dynamics of Global Crisis*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Amin, Samir. 1990. *Transforming the Revolution: Social Movements and the World-System*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Arrighi, Giovanni. 2010. *The Long Twentieth Century*. London: Verso.
- Arrighi, Giovanni and Beverly J. Silver. 1999. *Chaos and Governance in the Modern World-System*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Arrighi, Giovanni, Terence K. Hopkins, and Immanuel Wallerstein. 1989. *Antisystemic Movements*. London: Verso.
- Buechler, Steven M. 2000. *Social Movements in Advanced Capitalism: The Political Economy and Cultural Construction of Social Activism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carneiro, Robert L., Leonid E. Grinin, and Andrey V. Korotayev. 2017. *Chiefdoms: Yesterday and Today*. Clinton Corners, NY: Eliot Werner.
- Chase-Dunn, Christopher. 1981. "Interstate System and Capitalist World-Economy: One Logic or Two?" *International Studies Quarterly* 25, no. 1: 19–42.
- Chase-Dunn, Christopher. 1998. *Global Formation: Structures of the World-Economy*, 2nd edition. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Chase-Dunn, Christopher, and Bruce Lerro. 2014. *Social Change: Globalization from the Stone Age to the Present*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
- Chase-Dunn, Christopher, Hiroko Inoue, Teresa Neal, and Evan Heimlich. 2015. "The Development of World-Systems." *Sociology of Development* 1, no. 1: 149–72.
- Chase-Dunn, Christopher, and Thomas D. Hall. 1997. *Rise and Demise: Comparing World-Systems*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Denemark, Robert A. 1999. "World System History: From Traditional Politics to the Study of Global Relations." *International Studies Review* 1, no. 2: 45–73.
- Derluigan, Georgi M. 2005. *Bourdieu's Secret Admirer in the Caucasus: A World-System Biography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Frank, Andre Gunder. 1969. *Latin America: Underdevelopment or Revolution*. New York: Monthly Review.
- Frank, Andre Gunder. 1990. "A Theoretical Introduction to 5,000 Years of World System History." *Review* 13, no. 2: 155–248.
- Frank, Andre Gunder. 1998. *ReOrient: Global Economy in the Asian Age*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Harris, Kevan and Brendan McQuade, eds. 2015. "Special Issue: World-System Biographies." *Journal of World Systems Research* 21, no. 2: 276–459.
- Komlosy, Andrea. 2019. "Crises, Long Waves, and World-System Analysis." *Journal of Globalization Studies* 10, no. 2: 55–76.
- Moore, Jason W. 2003. "The Modern World-System as Environmental History? Ecology and the Rise of Capitalism." *Theory & Society* 32, no. 2: 307–77.
- Moore, Jason W. 2015. *Capitalism in the Web of Life: Ecology and the Accumulation of Capital*. London: Verso.
- Palumbo-Liu, David, Bruce Robbins, and Nirvana Tanoukhi, eds. 2011. *Immanuel Wallerstein And the Problem of the World*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Patel, Raj, and Jason W. Moore. 2017. *A History of the World in Seven Cheap Things*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Prigogine, Ilya. 1997. *The End of Certainty: Time, Chaos, and the New Laws of Nature*. New York: The Free Press.
- Roberts, J. Timmons, and Amy Hite, eds. 2000. *From Modernization to Globalization: Perspectives on Development and Social Change*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sanderson, Stephen K., ed. 1995. *Civilizations and World Systems: Studying World-Historical Change*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.
- Smith, Jackie. 2008. *Social Movements for Global Democracy*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- So, Alvin Y. 1990. *Social Change and Development: Modernization, Development, and World-System Theories*. London: Sage.
- Turchin, Peter and Sergey Gavrillets. 2009. "Evolution of Complex Hierarchical Societies." *Social Evolution & History* 8, no. 2: 167–98.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1974a. *The Modern World-System I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Academic Press.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1974b. "The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System: Concepts for Comparative Analysis." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 16, no. 4: 387–415.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1980. *The Modern World-System II: Mercantilism and the Consolidation of the European World-Economy, 1600–1750*. New York: Academic Press.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1989. *The Modern World-System III: The Second Era of Great Expansion of the Capitalist World-Economy, 1730–1840s*. New York: Academic Press.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1995. *Historical Capitalism with Capitalist Civilization*. London: Verso.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1999. *The End of the World as We Know It: Social Science for the Twenty-First Century*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2001. *Unthinking Social Science: The Limits of Nineteenth-Century Paradigms*, 2nd edition. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Wallerstein Immanuel. 2004a. *The Uncertainties of Knowledge*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2004b. *World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2005. *Africa: The Politics of Independence and Unity*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2009. "Reading Fanon in the 21st Century." *New Left Review* 11/57 (May–June): 117–25.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2011a. *The Modern World-System IV: Centrist Liberalism Triumphant*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2011b. "Thinking about the 'Humanities.'" In *Immanuel Wallerstein and the Problem of the World: System, Scale, Culture*, David Paumbo-Liu et al., eds. 223–6. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2013. "End of the Road for Runaway Factories?" *Commentary* 351, April 15. Available at <https://iwallerstein.com/road-runaway-factories/> accessed October 11, 2023
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2017. *The World-System and Africa*. New York: Diasporic Africa Press.
- Wilkinson, David. 1994. "Civilizations Are World Systems!" *Comparative Civilizations Review* 30: 59–71.
- Williams, Gregory P. 2020. *Contesting the Global Order: The Radical Political Economy of Perry Anderson and Immanuel Wallerstein*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Winders, William. 2009. *The Politics of Food Supply: U.S. Agricultural Policy in the World Economy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Further readings

- Braudel, Fernand. 1995. *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in Age of Philip II*, 2 vols, translated by Sian Reynolds. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Frank, Andre Gunder and Barry K. Gills, eds. 1993. *The World System: Five Hundred Years or Five Thousand?* London: Routledge.
- Silver, Beverly J. 2003. *Forces of Labor: Workers' Movements and Globalization since 1870*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

See also

- Historical Marxism; Structural Marxism; Economic Crises of Capitalism; Dependency Theory; Global Studies

24. Critical political economy

The prefix “critical” in the study of the global economy has probably never before been so much *en vogue* as it is today. Particularly since the outbreak of the 2007/08 global economic and financial crisis, there has been a growing interest in the inherent contradictions of capitalism, the rise of global debt, and the root causes of capitalist crises – all themes that take center stage in critical political economy. Indeed, who would not want to be critical at a time when global debt levels have reached historically unprecedented heights, heralding the advent of a crisis that may be far more dramatic than what we have witnessed since 2007/08? Moreover, even the most unwilling observers have to admit that the social inequalities and hardship exposed and exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic are linked to global capitalism, or that the relentless drive for profit-seeking has left behind a mammoth ecological footprint, a legacy of abuses of human rights and labor standards, the plundering of the Global South, and conflicts over natural resources. However, is critique, skepticism, or reflexivity with respect to the downsides of the global economy sufficient to be critical?

The prefix “critical” is a self-assigned label and what it means to be critical is often not further elaborated upon (Wigger and Horn 2016). With the increased usage of the term, inflationary tendencies may surface, risking that “critical” is merely a rhetorical proclamation or “a posh synonym for criticizing” (Sayer 2009, 768). This chapter explores “the critical” in critical political economy and argues that critical political economy comes with a range of ontological and epistemological commitments that go beyond mere criticism or critique. In particular, the role of explanatory critique in informing an emancipatory and transformative agenda is identified as the crux of what it means to be critical. Section one sketches the key ontological tenets, while section two discusses the role of normative claims, and contrasts critical political economy with what is commonly referred to as “mainstream” political economy, teasing out some key ontological, epistemological, and methodological differences. Section three provides an overview of

critical political economy research communities and academic outlets that feature critical political economy research. To be sure, this chapter does not attempt to offer a canonical “state-of-the-art” account of different critical political economy approaches and research (see Keucheyan 2013 for a comprehensive overview that goes beyond this sketchy portrayal of the basic ontological premises).

Critical political economy: an ontological primer

Critical political economy long used to be linked to Western Marxism, and in particular the Frankfurt School, or, at least, in canonical overviews, Marxist or Marxist-inclined approaches have almost routinely been labelled critical. Indeed, Karl Marx, through his engagement amongst others with the idealist philosopher Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, has laid the foundations of critical thought. His philosophy of science, method of inquiry, and his understanding of the theory-practice relationship continues to be central to critical political economy. However, the prefix “critical” is no longer associated with a single theoretical approach, and also pertains to feminist, reflexive, post-colonial, postmodern or poststructuralist approaches, and approaches committed to a post-positivist epistemology more generally (Linklater 1992). The famous distinction between “critical” and “problem-solving” theory by Robert Cox (1981, 1986, 1993), one of the key exponents of critical political economy, has levelled the road for a wide range of approaches that go beyond Marx. Then again, Cox, through popularizing the work of the Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci (1891–1937), also ensured the continuation of the Marxist legacy in the field of Global Political Economy (GPE), where critical political economy constitutes a major pillar. Yet, critical political economy spans several disciplines, and is therefore truly transdisciplinary in nature. In fact, Marx was also writing at a time when Economics, Sociology, and Political Science were not established as separate disciplines.

The field of GPE inquires who produces what, when, where, and how – how this translates into social power relations – and in extension, how the dynamic interplay of agents shaping and contesting how production is being organized and governed becomes man-

ifest in governmental and non-governmental institutions. Critical political economy takes this a step further by not only analysing but also problematizing the resulting social order, and the underlying ideational and material (production) structures, as well as the institutional strongholds that create and recreate this order. As Cox (1996, 88) defined it, critical political economy asks how this order came about, what the key mechanisms of power are, and whether it is about to change. Most critical political economy approaches, and most certainly historical materialist or Marxist, including Gramscian approaches, are rooted in an essentialist understanding of social reality, which entails that humans need to produce and reproduce to ensure their survival. These biological life requirements are satisfied through interacting with nature and with each other. The labor invested in the fulfillment of all the human wants and needs is usually a collective endeavor, and leads to social power relations. In the words of Cox (1986, 1), production “creates the material basis for all forms of social existence, and the ways in which human efforts are combined in productive processes affect all other aspects of social life.” The (re-)production of everyday life through labor lies at the foundation of every economic and political system, and the contemporary form through which production and social reproduction are collectively organized is capitalist in nature.

In contrast to the vast majority of political economists, who are reluctant to engage with capitalism or merely mention capitalism in passing only, critical political economy explains social phenomena and power relations in and through capitalism. While the social power relations emanating from the capitalist organization of (re-)production change over time, they are fundamentally skewed: the vast majority of people have to sell their labor power in return for a wage, and a minority, owning the means of production, extracts surplus value from labor in the form of a non-compensation of labor time. The accumulation of surplus capital through exploitation lies at the heart of social struggles; yet, in addition the capital-labor nexus, exploitation can also become manifest alongside sex, gender, age, race, ethnicity, and people with different abilities or sexual preference. Exploitation also takes place “outside” the immediate circuit of commodity production, trade, and finance, namely the

sphere of social reproduction, such as child, health and elderly care, education, family life, and sexuality – all spheres that are constitutive to the accumulation of capital at a given historical juncture. The accumulation of capital takes place under competitive conditions, erecting hierarchies in wealth and power within and across geographical regions. Moreover, it is never linear, exponential, or unproblematic, but pervaded by a range of contradictions, which can intensify and ultimately lead to capitalist crises. States codify, legitimize, and represent the various social and spatial inequalities, and at the same time reproduce state power by trying to stabilize the continuation of the accumulation of capital.

Based on this integrated understanding of the realm of politics, society, the state, and economic production, critical political economy is ontologically equipped to analyse the totality of social life and to ask the big questions, without losing sight of concrete and detailed phenomena. As Marx (1999 [1894], 557) reminds us, if everything was as it appeared on the surface, there would be no need for science, which is why critical political economy first and foremost seeks to deconstruct and demystify entrenched power asymmetries and forms of exploitation, domination, or repression, and explain them through the dynamics and contradictions arising from the capitalist organization of production, and its variegated manifestations throughout time and place. Critical political economy not only seeks to expose but also to condemn the conditions of inequality, exploitation, and oppression within capitalism. As Marx demonstrated in *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, it is impossible to talk about capitalism without critiquing it. Critical political economy also challenges research that does not question the prevailing capitalist order, and thereby implicitly or explicitly legitimizes, reproduces, and reaffirms this order. Such research is often antagonistically labelled as “mainstream” research, in order to demarcate critical research vis-à-vis established theories, forms of inquiry, and methods. Then again, critical political economy should not be conflated with mere criticism of the system, or disagreements and repudiations of existing theories and scholarship, although both elements are important key features. The distinction between “critique” and “criticism” is impor-

tant here. While “criticism” merely entails a negative judgement, “critique” refers to an inquiry into how truth claims are reached and legitimized as a naturalized state of affairs, and how such truth claims authoritatively inform social practices (Sayer 2009). If critical political economy merely involved the criticism of capitalist structures and unravelling scientific orthodoxies, taken-for-granted assumptions, or truth claims, it would be a redundant prefix. Throughout history, academics have consistently challenged academic ideas, refuted dominant common sense knowledge claims and practices informed by such knowledge. Certainly, critique is a first important step but posing new questions and reopening established intellectual terrains is an academic virtue that all scientists should practice, regardless whether they are critical or not. Knowledge and ideas are always fallible and thus disputable, which is why academics should continuously challenge and re-search their answers, or as Marx famously stated, *de omnibus dubitandum* – we should always have doubts about everything.

But if criticizing capitalist structures or refuting existing academic ideas and approaches does not suffice for appropriating the prefix “critical,” what does then make critical political economy critical? As Cox (1996, 90) has famously stated, an integral part of critical scholarship is not only to explain and critique structures in the existing social order but also to formulate coherent visions of alternatives that allow for transcending this order. Critical political economy, in other words, comes with an emancipatory and transformative commitment to build a more equal and just society. The theme of emancipation implies a unification of theory and practice: explanatory critique should contribute to the politicization and the resilience of social struggles revolving around the various capitalist forms of exploitation, and contribute actively to imagining alternative futures. Critical political economy may thus start out by giving ontological primacy to the negative, but it ultimately seeks to raise awareness about positive utopias. At the same time, critical political economy should not be mistaken with doctrinal finality, totalizing or rigid ideologies, and dogmatism. As Gill (2012, 519) put it, “critical thought can neither be singular, nor imprisoned by practices of theoretical closure.” Therefore, emancipatory social forces, or what Gramsci

referred to as a “collective intellectual,” are by definition composed of a plurality of forms of the philosophy of praxis. Multiple imaginary futures and horizons of common possibility can co-exist, coincide, or even contradict themselves. Ideally, through dialogue new political imaginaries, interventions, and alliances can be convoked and new political spaces be opened up.

Epistemology and methodology

Critical political economy, and in particular Marxist and Marxist-inclined approaches, have long been overshadowed by orthodox platitudes and sometimes polemically dismissed as biased, normative, and notoriously unscientific, and as lacking the necessary objectivity and scholarly distance to the research object. As a result, critical political economy has been marginalized in mainstream academic outlets, silenced or simply gone unmentioned. Although today no self-respecting political economy textbook can eclipse critical theories and approaches, in many Political Sciences departments, and even in the popular GPE Bachelor and Master programs, the specter of theoretical pluralism is still too often confined to textbooks only.

Indeed, critical political economy comes with a strong normative commitment to a more just and egalitarian society, and it seeks to explore and elucidate the theme of human emancipation. However, this does not render critical political economy more normative than the ostensibly value-neutral mainstream approaches. Conflating “critical” with “normative” is a widespread misconception that perceives positivist epistemologies as synonymous with “science,” or what is sometimes presumptuously referred to as “normal” science (see Kurki and Wight 2007; Wigger and Horn 2016). It is rooted in the positivist epistemological understanding that researchers can effectively distinguish between facts and values, and objectively perceive the subject of inquiry, and thus take a sort of Archimedean point of reference. Critical political economy rejects the claim to value neutrality and the possibility of a radical subject–object separation. Value-free science is not possible because every ontology, and thus also theory, is normative and thus political. As Cox (1986, 207) has famously stated, “theory is always for someone and or some purpose.” Theories that

do not reveal or question existing structures of social inequalities and oppression, implicitly or explicitly reaffirm the existing order and thus take a normative stance. Then again, theories are like filters that select, eliminate, and highlight certain aspects of social reality, and thereby inevitably create and distort this reality. Therefore, scholars should be aware of the value-bound nature of all theories, and state underpinning values and norms that inform their research more explicitly and more openly.

Critical political economy cannot subscribe to a positivist epistemology also for ontological reasons. While most theories, as a reflection of the perceived ontology, privilege either agency or structure, the ideational or the material, critical political economy approaches usually theorize the dialectical interplay of all four ontological dimensions without regressing into structural determinism, voluntarism, or meaningless eclecticism. Although humans upon birth enter a materially and ideationally pre-structured world, genuine importance is assigned to transformative agency, understood as overcoming and acting against rather than reproducing social structures. By perceiving the future as open-ended, and transformative agency as changing the course of history, there is no room for dogmatic orthodoxies or a closed teleology, or a reductionist understanding of humans as mere bearers of a cause-effect relationship. Although social structures cannot be changed easily or immediately in the foreseeable future, neither the realm of structure and agency, nor the ideational or the material is fixed. Then again, capitalism entails a range of abstract and recurrent contradictions that can be transhistorical and to some degree objective to capitalism; yet, this does not mean that social reality in capitalism can be understood through static theoretical concepts. As there can be no assumed, law-like generalizations or universal truths deducted from theories, this has epistemological consequences: a “plug-and-play” approach that gives primacy to mere theory testing, or what is sometimes also referred to as “theoreticism” is ruled out by definition and empirical observations cannot validate or, in a Popperian sense, falsify hypothesized cause-effect relations (see Popper 1963). One of the pitfalls of theoreticism is that analyses and propositions are developed to make them fit the theoretical assumptions, that is, theo-

ries determine what the researcher observes or believes, namely, a repetition of socioeconomic patterns and outcomes. In the academic mainstream, questions of epistemology and methodology tend to be privileged over ontology (Wight 2006), or ontological questions are simply ignored or declared metaphysical, and thus unscientific. Scholars accordingly adopt a particular epistemological conception of what social science ought to be, and then make the social ontology fit that conception (Buch-Hansen and Wigger 2011, 11). Critical political economy research seeks to break with such epistemological fallacies by giving primacy to ontology over epistemology.

Critical political economy is essentially pluralist and thus open to a combination of various methods as long as they are compatible with the ontological and epistemological assumptions. As regards methodology, common pathways or research strategies are the method of abstraction, retroduction, and conjunctural analysis. The method of abstraction consists of the iterative and dialectical moving back and forth between the abstract and the concrete condensed, focused empirical realm. This implies that theories, whether about capitalism or other modes of production, should evolve through the dialectical interplay between the abstract and the concrete. After all, abstract theory, while important, is not all-determining and needs constant adjustment and re-evaluation in the light of a changing social reality (Cox 1986, 209). This is also where retroduction comes in. Rather than departing from a general law about the nature of social reality and its causal mechanisms (deduction), or collecting a wide range of empirical observations aimed at revealing such a general law (induction), retroduction identifies the structures and mechanisms that are responsible for the occurrence of a phenomenon through a continuing process of confrontation between theoretical presumptions and “evidential statements generated in and through transitive enquiry” (Jessop 2005, 43). Last but not least, conjunctural analysis is the strategy to investigate the totality of developments across agency, structure, the ideational, and the material are being analysed in an integrative manner (Jessop 2008). To be sure, conjunctural analysis is demanding and often exceeds the capacity of individual researchers, which is why critical research

should be seen as collective endeavor (Jaeger 2019, 108).

The coming of age of critical political economy

Over the past decades, a thriving interdisciplinary critical political economy research community with its own institutionalized scholarly networks, conferences, debates, specialized journals, and book series has evolved. Exemplary is the *Critical Political Economy Research Network (CPERN)*, established in 2005, which is a leading forum that brings together scholars and activists from a vast array of disciplines. CPERN scholars have been active in key debates of our time, such as the effects of the 2008 global economic crisis and the subsequent Eurozone crisis (Huke et al. 2015; Jaeger and Springler 2016), the increasingly authoritarian and disciplinary approach taken by governments (Bruff 2014; Tansel 2017), the global rise of the far right (Worth 2019), or the transformation of the workplace in the so-called digital age (Moore 2017). Another important hub is the *International Initiative for Promoting Political Economy (IIPPE)*, founded in 2006, which welcomes all progressive brands of political economy, or the successful blog *Progress in Political Economy (PPE)*, which features contemporary critical political economy research and debates, and which recently has been branching out in a book series with the same name. Among the academic journal outlets that feature critical political economy research are *Capital & Class*, *Antipode*, *Economy & Society*, *Globalizations*, *New Political Science*, *New Political Economy*, and *Global Political Economy*.

Conclusion

Critical political economy is committed to a sustained ontological inquiry about the contradictions of global capitalism and the social struggles revolving around various forms of exploitation. While the same struggles can be analysed from a mainstream perspective, critical political economy goes beyond mere analysis by seeking to prepare the ground for political alternatives that improve the conditions of social life. To be critical should therefore be more than just a rhetorical assertion and be accompanied by an emanci-

patory praxis. Importantly, critical political economy does not prescribe a fixed pathway towards such an alternative order but rather entails a plurality of philosophies of praxis. Leaving the comfort zones of mere capitalist critique and envisaging a non-capitalist future may seem as a dauntingly naive endeavor. Alternative visions are always incomplete and imperfect and replete with contradictions. Yet, the mere possibility of envisioning a different world already holds the prospect of it becoming a viable project, particularly if we understand utopianism as ‘perpetually exploring new ways to perfect an imperfect reality’ (Niman 1997, 302). Spelling out utopias already entails a presentiment of how to get to the envisaged future society.

ANGELA WIGGER

References

- Bruff, Ian. 2014. “The Rise of Authoritarian Neoliberalism.” *Rethinking Marxism* 26, no. 1: 113–29.
- Buch-Hansen, Hubert and Angela Wigger. 2011. *The Politics of European Competition Regulation. A Critical Political Economy Perspective*. New York: Routledge.
- Cox, Robert W. 1981. “Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory.” *Millennium* 10, no. 2: 126–55.
- Cox, Robert W. 1986. “Social Forces, States and World Orders.” In *Neorealism and Its Critics*, edited by Robert O. Keohane. 204–45. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Cox, Robert W. 1996. *Approaches to World Order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gill, Stephen. 2012. “Towards a Radical Concept of Praxis: Imperial ‘Common Sense’ versus the Postmodern Prince.” *Millennium* 40, no. 3: 505–24.
- Huke, Niko, Monica Clua-Losada, and David Bailey. 2015. “Disrupting the European Crisis: A Critical Political Economy of Contestation, Subversion and Escape.” *New Political Economy* 20, no. 5: 725–51.
- Jaeger, Johannes. 2019. “Introduction to Critical Political Economy in a Multi-Paradigmatic Setting.” In *Principles and Pluralist Approaches in Teaching Economics. Towards a Transformative Science*, edited by Samuel Decker, Wolfram Elsner, and Svenja Flechtner, 101–17. New York: Routledge.
- Jaeger, Johannes and Elisabeth Springer, eds. 2016. *Asymmetric Crisis in Europe and Possible Futures. Critical Political Economy and Post-Keynesian Perspectives*. New York: Routledge.

- Jessop, Bob. 2008. *State Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Keucheyan, Razmig. 2013. *The Left Hemisphere. Mapping Critical Theory Today*. London: Verso.
- Kurki, Milja and Colin Wight. 2007. "International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity," edited by Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki and Steve Smith, 14–35. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Linklater, Andrew. 1992. "The Question of the Next Stage in International Relations Theory: A Critical-Theoretical Point of View." *Millennium* 21, no. 1: 77–98.
- Marx, Karl. 1999[1894]. *Capital Vol. III*. New York: International Publishers.
- Moore, Phoebe V. 2017. *The Quantified Self in Precarity. Work, Technology and What Counts*. New York: Routledge.
- Niman, Michael I. 1997. *People of the Rainbow: A Nomadic Utopia*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- Popper, Karl R. 1963. *Conjectures and Refutations*. London: Routledge.
- Sayer, Andrew. 2009. "Who's Afraid of Critical Social Science?" *Current Sociology* 57, no. 6: 767–86.
- Tansel, Cemal B. 2017. *States of Discipline: Authoritarian Neoliberalism and the Contested Reproduction of Capitalist Order*. London: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Wigger, Angela and Laura Horn. 2016. "Taking Critical Ontology Seriously: Implications for Political Science Methodology." In *Handbook of Research Methods and Applications in Political Science*, edited by Hans Keman and Jaap Woldendorp, 38–53. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Wight, Colin. 2006. *Agents, Structures and International Relations. Politics as Ontology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Worth, Owen. 2019. *Morbid Symptoms. The Global Rise of the Far-Right*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Further readings

- Callinicos, Alex, Stathis Kouvelakis, and Lucia Predella. 2021. *Routledge Handbook of Marxism and Post-Marxism*. New York: Routledge.
- Joseph, Jonathan. 2006. *Marxism and Social Theory*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Shields, Stuart, Ian Bruff and Huw Macartney, eds., 2011. *Critical International Political Economy. Dialogue, Debate and Dissensus*. Basingstoke: McMillan.

25. Global studies

Clyde W. Barrow and others have clearly laid out what they call critical political science, which focuses on power inequities and injustices and insists upon being “relevant” in theory and practice (Barrow 2017, 437; Easton 1969, 1052). Much of the scholarship in global studies (GS) can be seen as contributing to critical political science by investigating power dynamics through the lens of globalization (Darian-Smith and McCarty 2017; Zeiser 2020; Steger and Wahlrab 2017; Wahlrab 2020). Indeed, a careful review of GS literature reveals a large body of work that both employs and encourages going beyond the purely cognitive notion of critical thinking as simply “balanced reasoning” and instead offers an ethically engaged, problem centered, transdisciplinary approach to scholarship aimed at producing global citizens (Steger and Wahlrab 2017, 21; Darian-Smith 2020). While there are forms of GS that more closely align with “traditional” or “problem solving” theory, the spatial project of GS opens up considerable space for critical theory (Cox 1986; Horkheimer 1999; Appelbaum and Robinson 2005; Juergensmeyer 2014; Chase-Dunn 2020). In 1969, David Easton imagined that the post-behavioralist revolution might someday “release the social scientist from bondage to the unique needs and objectives of his own national political system” (Easton 1969). GS has lived up to this vision.

What is global studies?

Easton’s radical hope is given life in GS’s expansive spatial domain, which is inclusive of the local and the global and thus incorporates and encourages relational research by asking questions about power dynamics at global scales that undeniably “release the social scientist from bondage” (Khondker 2018, 93). In the most general sense, “global studies emerged in the late 1990s as a transdisciplinary field of academic inquiry exploring the many dimensions of globalization” (Steger and Wahlrab 2017, 1). For example, Roland Robertson, one of the early theorists of globalization outside of the economics field, formulated globalization by combining global-local or “glocal” terms as a process of “glocalization” (Robertson 1992, 1994;

Featherstone, Lash, and Robertson 1995). Robertson’s point is that globalization, or “glocalization,” promotes relational awareness and tends to force the consideration of the world as a “single place” that has both objective (material) and subjective (consciousness) dimensions. In other words, “globalization is about intensifying planetary interconnectivity,” not only at the level of the material (such as trade) but also the cultural, ideological, and imaginary (Steger 2020, 17).

As such, GS creates space to study power and other inequities on global scales, while simultaneously creating the conditions for analyses that show how global processes relate to local contexts (Brigden 2015, 2018). As Habib Haque Khondker explains: “globalization relativizes all particularisms, forcing exponents of specific beliefs or identities to confront and to respond to other particularistic ideas, identities, and social processes across the universal domain” (Khondker 2018, 96). In this manner, GS researchers and students are “forced” to compare particularities (biases, parochial attitudes, and policies) even when they are found within the individual researcher or student. Self-reflection is a byproduct of global study when done according to GS (Darian-Smith 2020). As Darian-Smith and McCarty explain, “critical thinking is present in the ways global studies scholarship interrogates the logics, categories, ideologies, and assumptions that reinforce hierarchies of power and the status quo” (Darian-Smith and McCarty 2017, 36).

Noncritical and critical GS

Whereas nearly all GS scholars would agree with a broad view of globalization as critical in the normal social science sense (Steger 2019), only about two-thirds would take it beyond the narrow sense of “critical globalization studies” or “transformative global studies” (Appelbaum and Robinson 2005; Hosseini et al. 2020). This has provoked scholars to divide GS into critical and “non-critical” GS (Robinson 2005). According to William I. Robinson, this subset of scholars and research assumes “a preferential option for the subordinate majority of emergent global society” (Robinson 2005, 14). In this context, critical global studies resonates with Pierre Bourdieu’s insistence on doing scholarship with commitment: “Today’s researchers must innovate an improbable but

indispensable combination; scholarship with commitment, that is, a collective politics of intervention in the political field that follows, as much as possible, the rules that govern the scientific field” (Bourdieu 2003, 24–5). Bourdieu’s now famous call for “public intellectuals” is answered in both GS and critical political science and fits with both fields’ desire to be relevant or the view that “knowledge is of no value if it is produced for its own sake, without a connection to a plan for making the world a better place” (DiMaggio 2018, 231; Kamola 2021). If, however, the point of GS as critical political science is to be socially engaged, then it makes sense to pay special attention to the socially engaged and critical elements of GS teaching and scholarship. From this point of view, even teaching “noncritical” GS is still more critical than teaching critical thinking as job preparation.

GS denaturalizes the world

The spatial remit of GS, however, serves to denaturalize the world and in doing so create the space for critical social sciences that challenge what it means to think critically about the world. GS as critical political science makes the connection between the supposedly neutral forms of critique and the ethical domain of socio-political practice. Critique is not neutral. Its links to the social world demand ethical considerations. Thus, even traditional “critical thinking inevitably contains a socio-political imperative” (Steger and Wahlrab 2017, 148). While the traditional and the ethical are often presented as a binary opposition, it might be helpful to think of them as dependent links in a chain of reasoning where analytical critique leads to socially engaged practice. To the extent that all theory is directly or indirectly connected to the social world, the distinction between theory and practice is less separable than the phrase implies.

Theory typically starts from experiences in the world as, for example, when someone experiences poverty and then joins the academy to do something about or limit inequality. However, students and scholars may need reminders since their graduate training may promote irrelevance: “advocacy work and efforts at disseminating one’s scholarship in public circles – known as public intellectualism – are not traits that are generally

valued very much in graduate school, in faculty hiring, or in the tenure and promotion process” (DiMaggio 2018, 231). To that end, those who identify themselves as critically oriented scholars seek to reveal power imbalances, inequalities, and injustice and then recommend that something be done to correct them. Indeed, GS scholars take the critical view to its broadest level of analysis by incorporating the “global imaginary” (Steger 2008). GS “suggests [that] students, wherever they are situated in the world, should be encouraged to think about historical and contemporary connections across, between and within the global south and the global north” (Darian-Smith 2020, 49). Students are encouraged to think like global citizens rather than future scholars who will be held in bondage: “students should be trained to appreciate that no one country can deal with the pressing challenges of our times (such as mass migrations, climate change, surveillance capitalism, and non-state conflict)” (Darian-Smith 2020, 49). In a review of GS degree programs and introductory GS textbooks scholars find that students are drawn into the field of GS with express statements that they will learn about the pressing problems of the day and then work to address them not as scholars held in bondage to national frameworks but as global citizens (Wahlrab 2020; Juergensmeyer 2019).

Educating for global citizenship

Educating for global citizenship and the production of emancipatory knowledge are two prominent examples of critical GS. Hans Schattle traces the roots of the term global citizenship from ancient Greek and Roman cosmopolitanism that viewed humans as deserving of equal respect and concern, regardless of geography or law. While numerous sectors have adopted the term “global citizenship” and imbued it with different meanings, the 1990s also saw the rise of the term’s usage in educational settings with emphasis placed upon inspiring young people to grow into morally responsible, intellectually competent, and culturally perceptive global citizens. This is especially notable in UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon’s 2012 educational initiative titled “Global Education First.” Priority Area 3 of the initiative specifically aims to “foster global citizenship.” Noting that the interconnected

global challenges of the twenty-first century call for far-reaching changes in how people think and act for the dignity of their fellow human beings, the document describes the crucial relationship between global education and global citizenship in the following way:

Education must be transformative and bring shared values to life. It must cultivate an active care for the world and for those with whom we share it ... Education must fully assume its central role in helping people to forge more just, peaceful, tolerant and inclusive societies ... We now face the much greater challenge of raising global citizens. Promoting respect and responsibility across cultures, countries and regions has not been at the centre of education (Ki-moon 2012, 20).

As Schattle notes, the promotion of global citizenship in the educational arena involves a number of elements: the cultivation of thinking beyond one's imagined physical boundaries toward a global consciousness of planetary interdependence; a sense of one's global responsibility and shared moral obligations across humankind; and the strengthening of democratic ideals of democratic empowerment and participation (Schattle 2008, 44–5). Perfectly capturing this chapter's central claim about GS, Schattle shows that studying the world through the lens of globalization facilitates precisely the engaged citizenship imagined by many GS scholars and in Ki-moon's statement. In other words, GS is one path to a particular form of global citizenship that calls for a "critical way of thinking and living within new geographical, intellectual, and moral horizons" (Schattle 2012, 14). Indeed, Duarte Morais and Anthony Ogden describe global citizenship as consisting of "social responsibility," "global competence," and "global civic engagement" (Morais and Ogden 2011, 445–66). Similarly, Mark Juergensmeyer shows how "global literacy" promotes the subjective sense of being "citizens of the world" who are vested in critically responding to the challenges of the day (Juergensmeyer 2012).

In an effort to measure the extent that global learning produces global citizens, the Association of American Colleges and Universities commissioned the Global Learning Value Rubric which defines "global learning" as the "critical analysis of and an engagement with complex, interdepend-

ent global systems and legacies (such as natural, physical, social, cultural, economic, and political) and their implications for people's lives and the earth's sustainability." The rubric consciously links the analytical and ethico-political dimensions of critical thinking, listing three desired global learning outcomes. First, students should become informed, open-minded, and responsible people who are attentive to diversity across the spectrum of differences. Second, they should be able to understand how their actions affect both local and global communities. Third, students should acquire the interest and facility to address the world's most pressing and enduring issues collaboratively and equitably (see www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/global-learning). (For an interesting example of elite global citizenship, see: Guerrero Fariás 2020.)

GS and emancipatory knowledge production

The discussion so far assumes that the texts that are assigned in classrooms are adequate to the task of creating global citizens and that teachers are educating students about substantive and relevant issues impacting the world. Where do GS scholars find inspiration? Noting the link between theory and practice, numerous scholars credit the Zapatistas and their uprising against the signing into law of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) on January 1, 1994, as an event that re-shaped their thinking about global citizenship and engaged teaching and scholarship. These revolutionaries, for their part, framed their uprising in global and local terms: "[W]e will make a collective network of all our particular struggles and resistances: an intercontinental network of resistance against neoliberalism, an intercontinental network of resistance for humanity" (Subcommandante Marcos, "First Declaration of La Realidad," August 3, 1996 <www.apostate.com/politics/realidad2.html>). Here the link between global education and the generation of emancipatory knowledge mentioned by Eve Darian-Smith becomes clear. The Zapatistas went on to invite thousands of global activists and scholars to collaboratively work to create a better world at the First Intercontinental Gathering for Humanity and Against Neoliberalism. At the Zapatista's gathering in the jungles of

Chiapas, scholars and activists were exposed to globalization-from-below initiatives that sensitized scores of scholars and activists to the suffering of poor peasants in the global South caused by market-globalist policies such as the IMF's lending practices of requiring developing countries to implement neoliberal structural adjustment programs (SAPs).

The Zapatista network went on to directly influence the creation in 2001 of the World Social Forum (WSF), which similarly focused on linking scholars and activists organizing against neoliberal globalization. This open forum and meeting place had two goals: to create an alternative narrative of what was possible in the era of globalization and to implement political change informed by this global justice narrative. The first goal of the WSF requires scholars, activists, and progressives to normalize the language of equality, global social justice, diversity, democracy, nonviolence, solidarity, ecological sustainability, and planetary citizenship. The second goal requires social forces to engage in direct political action to transform global political economic structures and the institutions that support them, like the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, Transnational Corporations, and the host of economic elites that benefit from the status quo.

Linking these two WSF goals, critical GS further connects to the global justice movement through the expansion of intellectual networks of globalization scholars seeking to better understand what helps and hinders progress on these goals of narrative construction and global change. For example, the Global Studies Association (GSA) seeks to do this by "promoting the creation and dissemination of multi and interdisciplinary knowledge in the social and human sciences concerning global affairs, problems and changes" (<https://gsauk.co/about/>). The GSA's fellow organization, the GSA-North America, was founded in 2002 and is led by globalization and labor historian Jerry Harris. The annual conferences by these organizations have helped accomplish the primary goal of global intellectual exchange and have also produced significant scholarly publications. Numerous global studies programs at universities throughout the world also serve as the intellectual training grounds for the next generation of global citizens, scholars, public servants, and activists for global change. (For

reviews of these organizations and programs, see Juergensmeyer 2019; Steger and Wahlrab 2017; Steger 2018; Juergensmeyer 2018; Darian-Smith and McCarty 2017.)

This chapter has shown that GS as critical political science is about understanding the world in order to change it – beginning with teaching and scholarship. It takes as its starting point the problems and challenges that ordinary people face but views them through the lens of globalization. Critical GS's normative focus is on changing the world by promoting ethically engaged global citizens.

AMENTAHRU WAHLRAB

References

- Appelbaum, Richard P., and William I. Robinson. 2005. *Critical Globalization Studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 2017. "The Political and Intellectual Origins of New Political Science." *New Political Science* 39, no. 4: 437–72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07393148.2017.1378297>.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 2003. *Firing Back: Against the Tyranny of the Market* 2. New York: New Press.
- Brigden, Noelle K. 2015. "Transnational Journeys and the Limits of Hometown Resources: Salvadoran Migration in Uncertain Times." *Migration Studies* 3, no. 2: 241–59. <https://doi.org/10.1093/migration/mnu044>.
- Brigden, Noelle K. 2018. *The Migrant Passage: Clandestine Journeys from Central America*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Chase-Dunn, Christopher. 2020. "Twenty-First century Deglobalization and the Struggle for Global Justice in the World Revolution of 20xx." In *The Routledge Handbook of Transformative Global Studies*, edited by S. A. Hamed Hosseini, James Goodman, Sara C. Motta, and Barry K. Gills, 29–43. London and New York: Routledge.
- Cox, Robert W. 1986. "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory." In *Neorealism and its Critics*, edited by Robert O. Keohane. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Darian-Smith, Eve. 2020. "Globalizing Education in Times of Hyper-Nationalism, Rising Authoritarianism, and Shrinking Worldviews." *New Global Studies* 14 (1): 47–68. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/ngs-2019-0020>.
- Darian-Smith, Eve, and Philip C. McCarty. 2017. *The Global Turn: Theories, Research Designs, and Methods for Global Studies*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.
- DiMaggio, Anthony. 2018. "Is Political Science Relevant? The Decline of Critical Scholarly Engagement in the Neoliberal Era." *Poverty &*

- Public Policy* 10 (2): 222–52. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/pop4.213>.
- Easton, David. 1969. “The New Revolution in Political Science.” *American Political Science Review* 63 (4): 1051–61. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055400263193>. www.cambridge.org/core/article/new-revolution-in-political-science/E79F43198009DBC2028DDE958030E36B.
- Featherstone, Mike, Scott Lash, and Roland Robertson. 1995. *Global Modernities*. London and Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Guerrero, Fariás and María Lucía. 2020. “Elite Global Citizenship, A Case of a Secondary School in Bogotá, Colombia.” *International Studies in Sociology of Education*: 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09620214.2020.1819373>.
- Horkheimer, Max. 1999. “Traditional and Critical Theory.” In *Critical Theory: Selected Essays*, 188–243. New York: Continuum.
- Hosseini, S. A. Hamed, James Goodman, Sara C. Motta, and Barry K. Gills, eds. 2020. *The Routledge Handbook of Transformative Global Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Juergensmeyer, Mark. 2012. “What Is Global Studies?” *global-e: A Global Studies Journal* 5. <http://global-ejournal.org/2011/05/06/what-is-global-studies-3/>.
- Juergensmeyer, Mark. 2014. *Thinking Globally: A Global Studies Reader*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Juergensmeyer, Mark. 2018. “The Evolution of Global Studies.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Global Studies*, edited by Mark Juergensmeyer, Saskia Sassen, Manfred B. Steger, and Victor Faessel, 21–35. London and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Juergensmeyer, Mark. 2019. “Evolving Global Studies.” In *Revisiting the Global Imaginary: Theories, Ideologies, Subjectivities: Essays in Honor of Manfred Steger*, edited by Chris Hudson and Erin K. Wilson, 17–31. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Kamola, Isaac. 2021. “The University and the World.” *International Politics Reviews*. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41312-021-00087-0>.
- Khondker, Habib Haque. 2018. “Glocalization.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Global Studies*, edited by Mark Juergensmeyer, Saskia Sassen, Manfred B. Steger and Victor Faessel, 93–111. London and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ki-moon, Ban. 2012. *Global Education First Initiative: An Initiative of the United Nations Secretary*. Global Education First Initiative. www.globaleducationfirst.org/files/GEFI_White_Brochure_UPDATED.pdf.
- Morais, Duarte B., and Anthony C. Ogden. 2011. “Initial Development and Validation of the Global Citizenship Scale.” *Journal of Studies in International Education* 15, no. 5: 445–66. <https://ezproxy.utttyler.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ943119&site=eds-live&scope=site> <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1028315310375308>.
- Robertson, Roland. 1992. *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. London: Sage.
- Robertson, Roland. 1994. “Globalisation or Glocalisation?” *The Journal of International Communication* 1 no. 1: 33–52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13216597.1994.9751780>.
- Robinson, William I. 2005. “What is a Critical Globalization Studies? Intellectual Labor and Global Society.” In *Critical Globalization Studies*, edited by Richard P. Appelbaum and William I. Robinson, 11–18. New York: Routledge.
- Schattle, Hans. 2008. *The Practices of Global Citizenship*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Schattle, Hans. 2012. *Globalization and Citizenship*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Steger, Manfred B. 2008. *The Rise of the Global Imaginary: Political Ideologies from the French Revolution to the Global War on Terror*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Steger, Manfred B. 2018. “What is Global Studies.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Global Studies*, edited by Mark Juergensmeyer, Saskia Sassen, Manfred B. Steger, and Victor Faessel, 3–20. London and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Steger, Manfred. 2019. *Globalisms: Facing the Populist Challenge*. 4th edn. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Steger, Manfred. 2020. *Globalization: A Very Short Introduction*. 5th edn. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Steger, Manfred B., and Amentahru Wahrab. 2017. *What is Global Studies? Theory & Practice*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Wahrab, Amentahru. 2020. “Global Studies.” In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Studies*, 1–29. London: Oxford University Press.
- Zeiser, Pamela. 2020. *Global Studies Research*. 1st edn. Los Angeles: SAGE/CQ Press.

See also

Manfred Steger; Theories of the State; Transnational State; Cultural Imperialism; Dependency Theory; Migration; Colonialism; Neo-Colonialism

26. Critical border studies

In the aftermath of the Second World War, the study of borders in the West was confined to the traditional disciplines of geopolitics and political geography. Consequently, “the border” was not acknowledged as a basic concept of political theory and political science. Instead, the border was taken for granted, and considered as a kind of neutral institution, insofar as borders appeared to be comparatively stable. Elsewhere in the world, however, the situation was quite different. In the context of the struggles and turmoil of decolonization, the establishment of new borders led to bloody conflicts, which in a way were foreshadowed by the catastrophe of the partition of the Indian sub-continent. The end of the Cold War substantially changed this situation and in Europe, in particular, the wars that spelled the end of Yugoslavia were a dramatic warning regarding the new relevance of borders. While mainstream authors were celebrating the emergence of a “borderless world” driven by a market economy and liberal democracy, there was a pronounced awareness among critical thinkers in the early 1990s that what was discussed as “globalization” was in fact characterized by the proliferation of borders and, at the same time, a profound transformation of borders. The work of Étienne Balibar (1992) can be considered as symptomatic in this regard.

Balibar’s work has definitely been very influential for the formation of the lively and heterogeneous field of critical border studies. Another book that deserves to be mentioned in this regard is Gloria Anzaldúa’s *Borderlands/La frontera* (1987). On the one hand, that book emphasized a whole set of questions that did not figure in the research agenda of traditional studies of the border, ranging from cultural and linguistic hybridization to the panoply of clandestine passages that involve negotiation of the hatred and violence constitutive of borderlands. On the other hand, Anzaldúa focused on movements of migration across the U.S. border, which would become a kind of iconic topic for critical border studies. More generally, it is precisely the nexus between borders and migration that spurred the development of

the field, amidst a whole set of developments that since the 1990s were characterized by a reinforcement and even fortification of borders against movements of migrants and refugees in many parts of the world. Critical border studies became intertwined with new forms of border activism and solidarity with migrants, while research and theory in the field worked the boundary between a number of disciplines, including legal and political theory, anthropology and critical geography, cultural and postcolonial studies (De Genova, Mezzadra, and Pickles 2015).

The nexus between borders and migration remains central in critical border studies today. From the point of view of political theory and science, there is a need to stress that crucial political concepts have been tested by such studies over the last years. The question of sovereignty, for instance, has been often reconsidered from the angle of the border, be it claiming its reinforcement following the lead of Giorgio Agamben (1998), or tracking its transformations and even waning (Vaughan-Williams 2009; Brown 2010). Citizenship has been also analysed, in a way taking the border as a crucial site for the production of its code, either focusing on exclusion or deploying more nuanced notions such as “differential inclusion” as an angle on the internal hierarchies of citizenship (Mezzadra and Neilson 2013). Issues of political subjectivity are more generally an important focus for critical border studies, in particular for scholars working along the lines of the “autonomy of migration approach,” which emphasizes the political dimensions of movements and struggles of migration as well as of the challenges they posit to borders (see for instance De Genova 2017). The transformations of territory, to conclude this necessarily incomplete list, is another important political topic that has been tackled by critical border studies, in an attempt to go beyond any “territorialist epistemology” and exploring the emergence of new territorial formations from the privileged angle provided by the transformations of borders (Parker, Vaughan-Williams, et al. 2009).

Sovereignty, citizenship, and territory, three of the notions that we have just mentioned, are obviously foundational concepts for modern Western political theory. It is not surprising that critical border studies engage with them. The border is indeed a constitu-

tive element of each of those notions. We can even add something more by noting that without the tracing of a border neither sovereignty nor citizenship and territory can exist. This is the reason why we contend that the border has a “productive” nature and that it makes sense to take it not only as a research object but also as a “method” (Mezzadra and Neilson 2013). What we mean by this is that the point of view provided by the border invites us to focus on the constituent moment of a whole series of concepts and institutions. Therefore, it allows us to grasp the interplay and relations of forces, the violence at stake in their working, and at the same time it opens up spaces where thinking of their radical transformation becomes possible. One can even say that there was a pronounced awareness of the scandalous, constituent role played by borders for politics at the very origin of modern political theory, for instance in the work of Thomas Hobbes. Nevertheless, it is symptomatic that the most significant reference to borders in *Leviathan* (1651) is not to be found in Part II (“Of Common-wealth”), but rather in Part I (“Of Man”), chapter 13, famously dedicated to the “Naturall Condition of Mankind” (Hobbes 1981, 187). A kind of neutralization of the border had already started.

A political theory of the border requires a pronounced awareness of the historicity of the concept of the border we are familiar with today – which means with the idea of the border as a line that separates on the map discrete political territories. It is important to repeat that such a concept is relatively recent, since it emerges in Europe between the sixteenth and seventeenth century through the combined effect of the birth of modern cartography and modern political theory that went hand in hand with the steady development of the modern territorial state (see Mezzadra and Neilson 2013, ch. 2). At the same time, it is obvious that the globalization of the border as a line was only possible through decolonization. Perhaps less obvious but quite important is the fact that European colonial and imperial expansion did not imply the “export” of the bordering techniques connected to the border as a line. The domination of colonial peoples and territories followed completely different blueprints, with a panoply of gradations, differential and hierarchical distribution of power and subjecthood, and “anomalous” spatial forma-

tions (Benton 2010). While this divergence of European and colonial histories of borders is a topic relevant in itself, colonialism provides us with a rich archive of bordering technologies and territorial arrangements that in many ways and in unexpected combinations are reemerging today across diverse geographical scales.

The border as a line continues to be the main normative reference for international politics and quite often for political theory and science in our present. Moreover, processes of border reinforcement shape political rhetoric and even concrete border policies in many parts of the world. Imagined or concrete walls are springing up, while national security and even independence are often invoked to advocate a restrictive border politics. The ensuing impression can be that the border as a line continues to be firm as it is designed to be. Critical border studies (at least some of them, the ones that we find more interesting and challenging) provide us with a radically different picture. The point is of course not to deny the absolutely concrete effects of processes of border reinforcement – first of all on migrants and refugees, whose border crossing is made more exhausting, perilous, and too often lethal. What is worth emphasizing is rather that, at the same time, borders are made more and more flexible and mobile, drawing complex and even elusive geographies of control. Processes of “border externalization,” which means the involvement of third countries in the border policy of a given state usually with respect to migration, are a classical example of such mobility of borders and are more and more widespread today (see for instance De Genova, Mezzadra, and Pickles 2015, 73–7 and Casas-Cortes, Cobarrubias, and Pickles 2015). Take for instance Mexico, which has been turned into a “vertical border” by pressures of the U.S. and negotiation with other Central American governments (see Aquino, Decosse, and Varela 2013). As Balibar wrote several years ago, borders do not exist anymore simply “at the edge of territory, marking the point where it ends.” They “have rather been transported into the middle of political space” (Balibar 2004, 109).

Before picking up again on Balibar’s words, there is a need to point to another important question. We highlighted the relevance of political questions for critical border studies. Less explored in the field is the

critique of the political economy of borders, which we find crucially important. What is the relation of capital, in history and present, with borders? We know from Marx that capital is characterized by an expansive drive, by a push against any “limit” (Marx uses the German word *Grenze*, which also means “border”). Capital’s space is ultimately and necessarily the “world market” (Mezzadra and Neilson 2013). At the same time, it continuously negotiates its relations with what scholars of “world system theory” call “territorialism” (see Arrighi 1994). It inscribes its expansive frontiers within shifting assemblages of territorial boundaries. Looking at migration in particular, it is easy to see that especially since the nationalization of labor markets in the late nineteenth century in Europe, the border played paramount roles in the production and reproduction of labor power. This provides us with an important critical angle on the operations of borders even today, although in conditions that have dramatically changed with respect to not only the nineteenth century but also the height of industrialization and “Fordism.” Besides this, borders have also historically enabled the forging of specific national frameworks for the development of capitalism and have mediated the access of specific capitals to the “world market.”

Such questions are not merely economic, they are rather deeply political. And there is a need to study them. Contemporary capitalism seems significantly different to previous capitalist formations also from the point of view of its relations with borders. To be clear, borders continue to matter. They often provide indispensable devices of articulation for the global processes that enable contemporary forms of valorization and accumulation of capital. The flexibility of borders enables recruitment schemes of migrant labor adequate to the flexibility of production, while the rigidity of borders filters and stops unwanted migratory movements, often producing “illegal” workforces (De Genova 2005). Even processes of financialization are far from ethereal and are predicated upon complex relations with territory and borders.

Nevertheless, what needs to be emphasized is that today capital is able more than ever to produce its own spaces. Logistics, which is definitely important for the working of contemporary capitalism, is particularly important from this point of view. Deborah

Cowen (2014) notes that logistical spaces are characterized by the prevalence of what she calls “seams” as opposed to borders that seal a political space. If one looks at the peculiar spatial formations connected to the operations of logistics, from the hub to the corridor, from the special economic zone to the hotspot, it is easy to see that a new capitalist geography is emerging, with relevant potential frictions with the political geography predicated on borders. Needless to say, this geography has its lines of demarcation and exclusion. Both those frictions and these lines of demarcation should figure prominently in the future research agenda of critical border studies.

Going back to the quote by Balibar, who contends that borders have been transported “into the middle of political space,” we need to note that over recent years we have witnessed a growing attention to a panoply of “internal” boundaries. In many parts of the world, the flexibilization and the reinforcement of border regimes, which critical scholars attempt to grasp through the notion of “border regime” (see for instance Hess and Kasparek 2010), have run parallel to a whole set of processes that challenge the homogeneity of citizenship, territory, and labor. New and old borders proliferate to nurture a differential and hierarchical governance of such processes of heterogenization. New urban boundaries emerge, intertwining with old ones, demarcations surround specific productive, logistical, and extractive sites, legal boundaries penetrate the fabric of citizenship, new hierarchies cross and divide the composition of labor, gender and race establish peculiar boundaries that are spread across society as a whole. None of the boundaries we have just mentioned is completely new. But we are convinced that we are confronted with a new scale in the proliferation of boundaries across formally unified political spaces. While there is a need to take stock of the implications of such proliferation for the main political concepts we continue to employ, it is also necessary to trace the connections between the new salience of internal boundaries and the ways in which international borders are managed and governed.

Thinking of specific borders and borderlands, where tensions and conflicts surrounding movements of migration are particularly intense, images of humanitarian catastrophe come to mind – people dying in the desert or drowning at sea, child detention or over-

crowded detention centers on islands. Such scandalous images nurture an indignation that builds a key feature of critical border studies. While it is important to acknowledge that humanitarian actors have been relevant figures in border activism (and often also in border regimes) over the last two decades, it is also necessary to critically analyse the kind of “gaze” on the border that is nurtured by “humanitarian reason” (Fassin 2012). On the one hand, the border is unilaterally posited as the scene of a “crisis,” of an “emergence” that obscures the relations with wider processes on both sides of the border. On the other hand, “humanitarian reason” reproduces a patronizing gaze on the people to be “rescued,” a “victimization” that ultimately deprives them not only of any agency but also of their peculiar histories. One of the main challenges for the analysis of border politics today lies precisely in the forging of an alternative approach, one that emphasizes the agency of people on the move while recognizing the persistent role of race, gender, and class that are often inscribed onto their very bodies.

Such an approach allows researchers to remain focused on the specificity of what happens at a single border while at the same time connecting it to wider processes that are prompting a proliferation of borders and the emergence of new territorial formations elsewhere. The notion of “border struggles” can be helpful here to politicize such an analysis (Mezzadra and Neilson 2013, ch. 8). Speaking of struggles with respect to what is often framed in terms of a humanitarian catastrophe emphasizes the political stakes surrounding borders and the challenges posited to them by movements of migration. Needless to say, it does not necessarily imply any form of “consciousness” on the side of migrants. It simply attempts to grasp the intensity of a material clash among forces, without in any way losing sight of the often tragic outcome of that clash. Border struggles remind us that it is at the border that crucial aspects of citizenship, territory, justice, and labor markets are negotiated every day. And while there is a need to repeat once again that border struggles fought along international borders remain absolutely specific since they are too often struggles for life or death, we are convinced that the notion of border struggles has a much wider scope. It needs to be operationalized in a way that allows an analysis

of the proliferation of borders that crisscross the present with a focus on a proliferation of struggles. Indeed, a cartography of borders needs to be at the same time a cartography of struggles.

SANDRO MEZZADRA AND BRETT NEILSON

References

- Agamben, Giorgio. 1998. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Anzaldúa, Gloria. 1987. *Borderlands/La Frontera*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.
- Aquino, Alejandra, Amarela Varela, and Frédéric Decossé, eds. 2013. *Desafiando Fronteras. Control de movilidad y experiencias migratorias en contexto capitalista*. Oaxaca: Frontera Press/Sur.
- Arrighi, Giovanni. 1994. *The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power, and the Origins of Our Times*. London: Verso.
- Balibar, Étienne. 1992. *Les Frontières de la Démocratie*. Paris: La Découverte.
- Balibar, Étienne. 2004. *We the People of Europe. Reflections on Transnational Citizenship*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Benton, Lauren. 2010. *A Search for Sovereignty*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, Wendy. 2010. *Walled States, Waning Democracy*. New York: Zone Books.
- Casas-Cortes, Maribel, Sebastian Cobarrubias, and John Pickles. 2015. “Riding Routes and Itinerant Borders.” *Antipode* 47, no. 4: 894–914.
- Cowen, Deborah. 2014. *The Deadly Life of Logistics: Mapping Violence in the Global Trade*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- De Genova, Nicholas, ed. 2017. *The Borders of “Europe.” Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- De Genova, Nicholas. 2005. *Working the Boundaries: Race, Space, and “Illegality” in Mexican Chicago*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Fassin, Didier. 2012. *Humanitarian Reason. A Moral History of the Present*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hess, Sabine and Bernd Kasperek, eds. 2010. *Grenzregime. Diskurse, Praktiken, Institutionen in Europa*. Berlin: Assoziation A.
- Hobbes, Thomas. 1981. *Leviathan*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Mezzadra Sandro, Nicholas De Genova and John Pickles, eds. 2015. “New Keywords: Migration and Borders.” *Cultural Studies* 29, no. 1: 55–87.
- Mezzadra, Sandro and Brett Neilson, *Border as Method, or, the Multiplication of Labor*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- Parker, Noel, Nick Vaughan-Williams et al. 2009. "Lines in the Sand? Towards an Agenda for Critical Border Studies." *Geopolitics* 14, no. 3: 582–7.
- Vaughan-Williams, Nick. 2009. *Border Politics: The Limits of Sovereign Power*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

27. Critical pedagogy

Critical pedagogy operates according to simple laws: (1) transform the world in egalitarian ways, (2) undermine oppressive modes of authority, and (3) shatter hierarchical formations in the classroom. For critical pedagogy, the arena for struggle is the classroom and the supporting institutions that constitute it as a space for the social control of underprivileged populations slated for low-wage work serving the ruling class. Inspired by post-colonial theory, critical pedagogy attacks the presumed neutrality of the people and institutions that disseminate knowledge. Critical pedagogy has its origins in the workers' educational movements that emerged in the 1920s and 1930s (Barrow 1989), but today critical pedagogy is most associated with Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1968), which articulates critical pedagogy as a form of intellectual emancipation and the revolutionary transformation of society. For Freire, a critical, radical, and utopian pedagogy names the possibility of a better future and requires undermining the authority, hierarchy, and knowledge nexus. Given the radical message of critical pedagogy, it is not surprising that the field of political science operates as if critical pedagogy does not exist.

In addition to neglecting critical pedagogy, one could also say that the history of political science pedagogy is a history of neglect of sustained reflection on teaching and learning. It is also a history of confusion between conflicting goals, namely, the education and reproduction of ruling elites, the education of working people for democratic citizenship, building a common culture through education as a form of social glue, assimilating new individuals into the body politic, and the democratization of colleges and universities. These competing goals signal important shifts in society that impact political science as a discipline. Macro-political and economic issues, competing pedagogical practices, political activism on university campuses, and the internal politics of the discipline itself are also in play pertaining to critical pedagogy.

The neglect of critical pedagogy in political science is ironic. Political scientists are committed to democracy and to educating the public. Critical pedagogy promotes egalitari-

anism and democracy. Democracy and education are reciprocally reinforcing practices. The quality of the former depends on the quantity of the latter. An education can turn a self-absorbed private person into a democratic citizen capable of recognizing and fighting for the public good. It is common to hear political scientists talk about the educational role of the discipline in abstract and conventional terms. These conversations, however, usually do not include radical perspectives on pedagogy. The limitations of a narrow and conventional approach to pedagogy are compounded by the fact that "contemporary academic culture is not merely indifferent to teaching," as Benjamin Barber claims, "it is actively hostile to it" (Barber 1992, 196).

Even if critical pedagogy is not on the agenda, not all political scientists ignore pedagogy. Stephen T. Leonard's "The Pedagogical Purposes of Political Science" is an insightful attempt to chart the educational role of political science and democratic citizenship but it also contains blind spots. Written from a descriptive historical perspective, Leonard outlines various pedagogical trajectories but in an entirely uncritical manner. He focuses on the various aims of pedagogy (e.g., civic education; the training of civil servants; and the reproduction of scholars) as opposed to asking the broader philosophical questions pertaining to pedagogy itself. Under what conditions does learning take place? How does one best educate another human being? How do pedagogical practices connect to the broader political and economic context? Whose voices are part of the conversation on pedagogy? Leonard's neglect of broader pedagogical-philosophical questions gives it a narrow focus. This diminishes its significance for critical reflection on the interrelationship between democratic citizenship and pedagogy (Leonard 1995).

Another example that avoids these broader questions and explicitly opposes egalitarianism is Allan Bloom's *The Closing of the American Mind*. This is a book that promulgates an elitist mode of pedagogy and seeks to protect the university as a space for white male privilege. Specifically, the goal of this text is to decry the advances made by women and ethnic minorities on university campuses in terms of changes to the curriculum (e.g., feminism, multiculturalism) and to make the case for a return to the era of excellence

and high standards (e.g., the 1950s) where universities cultivated the classically educated gentleman. As Bloom puts it, his text is a "meditation on the state of our souls," a rejection of relativism which "undermines education," and a defense of the authoritative teacher of "Great Books" to ask the "permanent questions." Bloom seeks to snuff out feminism, the "enemy of the vitality of classic texts." He seeks to return us to the glorious age of the 1950s, a time when a limited range of perspectives (e.g., European; white; male) constituted the university curriculum. For him, the 1960s ruined everything. It is surprising that such an anti-democratic statement on pedagogy and citizenship would gain such a foothold in the U.S. and become a best seller (Bloom 1987, 15, 34, 65, 252, 322).

Others flag the crisis in education today from relativistic openness, a lack of moral grounding, and a debunking of our own system. For this perspective what we need instead is an appreciation of "Great Books" that awaken an anti-utopian awareness of the "essential limitations on what may be expected from political life or action." Education is construed as the cultivation of reverence for the American system, soul-craft, the discovery of a priori foundations, and a return to the laws of nature (Pangle and Pangle 1993, 50–51, 287). Pedagogy emerges as an ideological practice that celebrates the political and economic status quo. The student memorizes what they are supposed to know about the American dream and the triumph of the west. The student thereby learns nothing about the role power and privilege play in the American political system.

The liberal model of teaching, learning, and citizenship is also an official ideology of the political and economic status quo. It shares some but not all the goals and pedagogical practices of the conservative-fundamentalist approach flagged above (e.g., need for political common ground/American creed as a source of unity and stability; defense of private property; constitutionalism; and rule by elites/experts in a watered-down version of representative democracy). Originally, classical liberal thought was a form of radical dissent theory grounded on the right to resist illegitimate usurpations of power. It provided the philosophical principles that undermined the caste system of the *ancien régime*. Over time, liberal theory became a defense of private property and formal legal procedures

for the resolution of conflict. For liberals, the state is neutral and promotes equality. Rights serve as protections against excessive state power. Liberal political education is minimalist (e.g., basic knowledge of how a bill becomes a law). Within the framework of this liberal democratic system, public schools teach tolerance and help us forge a common political culture. As critics have pointed out, liberalism as pedagogy lacks a robust theory of citizenship and suffers from delusions of grandeur and historical amnesia. The politics and content of liberal pedagogy are narrow and teach students the appropriate stance (e.g., acritical adoration) on free markets, private property, and representative democracy. Ignored is the historical record in terms of the treatment of marginalized groups and the structural impact of exclusion clauses in the definition and practice of citizenship. The liberal narrative is inflected by the discourse of infinite progress. Yet again, students learn nothing about the role of power and privilege in the American political system.

Liberal cosmopolitanism offers another important perspective on pedagogy and citizenship. This view advocates a form of "world citizenship" where we achieve a "sophisticated grasp of human variety" and broaden our perspective but nonetheless find common ground in core political principles and the primacy of reason. Martha Nussbaum has emerged as one of the leading proponents of this position. She argues that a "world identity" is better than one rooted in a "racially based group identity" (Nussbaum 1997, 62, 168). For Nussbaum, we must seek mutual understanding via tolerance and a broad form of open-mindedness: "The cosmopolitan puts right before country and universal reason before the symbols of national belonging" (Nussbaum 2002, 17). Much to its credit, this position prevents excessive patriotism and extreme forms of group identity. However, liberal cosmopolitanism as pedagogical practice is not as open to otherness as the label implies. Liberal cosmopolitanism contains difference via defensive gestures that perpetuate a static conception of reason and the West. Nussbaum states that students "must learn enough about the different to recognize common aims, aspirations, and values" (Nussbaum 2002, 9). As such, learning about different cultures is ultimately a homogenizing gesture to recognize what we all have in common as opposed to genuinely

learning about what is different. Because of this, Nussbaum inadvertently promulgates a neocolonial discourse that comes close to the form of patriotism she criticizes.

Another perspective on pedagogy and citizenship is activist. It stresses the value of active political engagement as a form of ongoing learning (e.g., service learning), criticizes rights-based models of citizenship, and it seeks to preserve, perpetuate, and encourage widespread participatory democracy. The Greek polis, republican Rome, town hall meetings, and Soviet council system are frequent reference points. Social movements are its life blood. Political engagement by active citizens is its spirit. Political participation is both an end and a means to make the world a better place. Civic deliberation and service learning are pedagogical practices that promote political engagement as a way of life. The drawback of this perspective is that it lacks a critical, radical, and utopian perspective on pedagogy. The descriptive-historical, fundamentalist/conservative, liberal, cosmopolitan, and activist approaches constitute the horizon of political science pedagogy and citizenship today. Critical pedagogy is also avoided by dominant currents in the sub-field of political theory.

The form of pedagogy peddled by Leo Strauss is a defense of the timeless truths contained in a limited number of canonical texts. A strange mix of paranoia and hatred of the *demos*, Strauss's celebration of the Western tradition is ultimately a defense of the privilege of the current reigning political and economic elite and the need to protect them from democratic challenge. Pedagogically, Strauss seeks to cultivate intellectual aristocrats. For Strauss, common people are incapable of obtaining and even recognizing a quality education. The erudition provided by the Western tradition provides the foil for Strauss's elitist political agenda (See Sokoloff 2020, 27–49).

Commonly praised by his followers as a democratic theorist of the first rank, Sheldon S. Wolin also brings us to a dead-end in terms of critical pedagogy. Political theory is not a body of knowledge with a relatively fixed set of concerns (as Wolin stipulates) but is something that changes over time and is open to infinite reinvention. Wolin's reverence for the tradition nullifies this open-ended and radical aspect of political theory. The teacher is not an authoritative dispenser of knowledge (as Wolin stipulates) but a provocateur

for critical thinking. Critical pedagogy puts into question the authority, hierarchy, and knowledge nexus promulgated by Wolin to open a new horizon for student voice and learning (see Sokoloff 2020, 27–49).

The Socratic Method (e.g., argumentative questioning, answering, and refutation) is commonly viewed and touted as an exemplary educational practice. From the vantage point of critical pedagogy, it is adversarial under conditions of unequal power and ignores the broader political context. It is also hierarchical and authoritarian, albeit in subtle ways. The Socratic Method is also a practice based on questionable epistemological assumptions about the character of knowledge and perpetuates an aggressive and masculinist mode of discourse. To make it a form of critical pedagogy, the Socratic Method requires dialectical radicalization. This would lead to a greater awareness and sensitivity to questions of power in the classroom pertaining to pedagogy that instructor-led forms of the Socratic Method have occluded. The Socratic Method can be a mode of intellectual emancipation based on challenging all forms of authority, triggering a shift in power from the instructor to the student and moving us beyond the active learning method which, just like Socrates and his followers, masks its power and control behind proclamations of openness and transparency (Sokoloff 2020, 51–68).

Critical pedagogy is at best a marginal practice in the field of political science (Norton and Ollman 1978). It does not play a central role in reflection about teaching and learning in the discipline of political science. The exclusion of critical, radical, and utopian perspectives on political science pedagogy plays itself out in publications on teaching and learning and becomes a self-perpetuating circle. The questions raised by one scholar, as well as what is regarded as the relevant literature, serve in turn to condition what passes as appropriate research on teaching and learning in the next study. Critical pedagogy is an anti-authoritarian and non-mainstream perspective that shatters the authority, hierarchy, and knowledge nexus and transforms pedagogy into the practice of equality. Critical pedagogy also puts into question the medieval vision of the teacher and university grounded on the authority, hierarchy, and knowledge nexus. The authority, hierarchy, and knowledge nexus silences students,

entrenches inequality, and perpetuates the privilege of political and economic elites and their offspring. Critical pedagogy is the practice of equality and freedom for everyone, not just for the privileged.

Critical pedagogy as articulated by its main defenders and theorists (e.g., Freire, hooks, Rancière) is a dialectical practice between teachers and students where students achieve an understanding of the political forces that position them at a particular location in society and emancipate themselves. Critical pedagogy assumes knowledge is never completely isolated from questions of power. The questions posed by critical pedagogy are simple: What role has the educational sphere played in a historically racist, patriarchal, and capitalist society characterized by entrenched privilege and inequality? Why are students often passive and silent in the classroom? How can pedagogical practices play a role in the creation of a better and more just world? How do students acquire an understanding of the role power and privilege play in the American political system? By asking these questions and providing this more self-consciously critical and macro approach to the politics of pedagogy, vistas can be opened for new modes of thought and action, new types of research on pedagogy can emerge and a broader conversation about the prospects for thoughtful social and political transformation can take place. As Stephen Gilbert Brown aptly puts it, "pedagogy among the oppressed is not about the transmission of knowledge; it is about the transference of power" (Brown 2000, 216).

The point of this is not to engage in indoctrination but to expand the political horizons of students so they are able to engage in intelligent modes of political analysis and struggle based on an honest assessment of what is happening (e.g., the role that power and privilege play in their lives). This begins with the cultivation of the critical faculties through readings, discussions, assignments, and activities that put into question the myths of the political and economic status quo. Structural analysis can fruitfully illuminate the patriarchal, racist, colonial, heteronormative, and class biases that have constituted the hidden curriculum in political science. Liberal versus conservative does not constitute a real choice when it comes to pedagogy. Both are uncritical and anti-utopian perspec-

tives that mystify power relationships and trap us in the cyber-cage of the present.

Critical pedagogy operates according to a law: everything can be otherwise than it is. The point is to expand political horizons beyond the parameters of the status quo and to inspire hope and optimism. Radical analysis is the precondition for new forms of research, thought and political struggle. For critical pedagogy, we must think outside of the dominant frames of reference (e.g., liberal, conservative, cosmopolitan, and activist) because these perspectives limit the political imagination. Beyond all of this, radical means promoting structural change that undermines various forms of domination and allows for human flourishing for all people, not only for the non-working 1 percent. In this regard, critical pedagogy is utopian. Utopian aspirations motivate political struggle. The commitment to utopia will inevitably lead to some experiences of loss and failure. Far from taking the steam out of a utopian sensibility, failure and loss comprise valuable moments of learning and can inspire us to innovate and press on. In this way, failure is a pedagogical opportunity to grapple with the distance between theory and practice to open new vectors for thought and action.

Critical pedagogy insists on the importance of student voice and connecting course content to the lives of students. It also highlights the inescapable political choices involved in the construction of a curriculum. Critical pedagogy has a simple message. It is time to shatter the authority, hierarchy, and knowledge nexus. This nexus is a form of social control and stands in the way of equality and real democracy. The promise of critical pedagogy is simple. Helping students acquire an understanding of the role power and privilege play in their life, exploring ways to contest it and creating a future that makes life worth living.

WILLIAM W. SOKOLOFF

References

- Barber, Benjamin. 1992. *An Aristocracy of Everyone: The Politics of Education and the Future of America*. New York: Basic Books.
- Barrow, Clyde W. "Pedagogy, Politics, and Social Reform: The Philosophy of the Workers' Education Movement." *Strategies: A Journal of Theory, Culture and Politics* 2 (Fall 1989): 45–66.

- Bloom, Allan. 1987. *The Closing of the American Mind: How Higher Education Has Failed Democracy and Impoverished the Souls of Today's Students*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Brown, Stephen Gilbert. 2000. *Words in the Wilderness: Critical Literacy in the Borderlands*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Freire, Paulo. 2014. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, translated by Myra Bergman Ramos. New York: Bloomsbury.
- hooks, bell. 1994. *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- Leonard, Stephen T. 1995. "The Pedagogical Purposes of Political Science." In *Political Science in History: Research Programs and Political Traditions*, edited by James Farr, John S. Dryzek, and Stephen T. Leonard, 66–98. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Norton, Theodore Mills and Bertell Ollman, eds. 1978. *Studies in Socialist Pedagogy*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. 1997. *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. 2002. *For Love of Country*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Pangle, Lorraine Smith and Thomas Pangle. 1993. *The Learning of Liberty: The Educational Ideas of the American Founders*. Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Press.
- Rancière, Jacques. 1991. *The Ignorant Schoolmaster: Five Lessons in Intellectual Emancipation*, translated by Kristin Ross. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Sokoloff, William W. 2020. *Political Science Pedagogy: A Critical, Radical and Utopian Perspective*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave.

See also

bell hooks; Bertell Ollman; Paulo Freire

28. Critical university studies

Political scientists in the United States have contributed little to the study of education and even less to the investigation of the colleges and universities that employ them. As Michael McLendon (2003, 166) observes: “research on the politics of higher education remains scant, fragmented, limited in substantive scope, and loosely tethered to disciplinary insights of political science or other cognate fields” (see also Gift and Webbels 2014). Indeed, it was not until 2020 that the American Political Science Association (2020) created an official section designed to “bring together political scientists interested in the political causes and consequences of education policy and education systems.” If political scientists take pride in their analyses of power, no matter where it may be found, their inattentiveness to the institutions that govern their own work is a puzzle. That critical political science has done no better is a puzzle wrapped in an enigma.

The discipline of political science has long neglected the university. The two decades on either side of the onset of the twentieth century witnessed what one contemporary dubbed the professors’ “literature of protest” (Jastrow 1908, 326). Afforded its most memorable articulation in Thorstein Veblen’s *The Higher Learning in America: A Memorandum on the Conduct of Universities by Business Men* (2015), this literature’s now mostly forgotten contributors shared a deep animus toward the tycoons who, arising out of industrial capitalism, sought to fashion the academy on the model of an autocratic profit-driven corporation (Barrow 1990). What they did not share was a common scholarly background, let alone an affiliation with the incipient discipline of political science. In fact, the volume that Veblen credited with inspiring his work, James McKeen Cattell’s *University Control* (1913a, 1913b), included contributions from professors of psychology, philosophy, history, geology, ethics, economics, and a lawyer who doubled as an essayist. The American Political Science Association, founded a decade earlier, went entirely unrepresented in Cattell’s book.

The heirs to this early literature of protest are now grouped beneath the rubric of

“critical university studies” (CUS), and this work too is marked by a dearth of political scientists. Coined by a student of literary and cultural studies, this handle made its initial appearance in Jeffrey Williams’s 2012 article “Deconstructing Academe: The Birth of Critical University Studies.” With this label, Williams (2012) raised a retrospective umbrella over two decades of scholarship whose common denominators are: (1) a focus on “the actual practices and diverse institutions of contemporary higher education,” which signifies not merely its “field of reference” but also a refusal to be seduced by nostalgia for an academy that never was; (2) its “cross-disciplinary character,” as illustrated by a casual disregard for the fiefdoms that now claim special jurisdiction over specific objects of inquiry; and (3) an “oppositional stance,” as indicated not just by CUS’s attentiveness to “how higher education is an instrument of its social structure, reinforcing class discrimination rather than alleviating it,” but also “its organic connection to graduate-student unionization and adjunct-labor movements.”

So delineated, whatever coherence CUS displays cannot be a function of its secure departmental home, singular methodology, or unique theoretical perspective. Absent these more familiar ways of demarcating scholarly endeavors, determination of what counts as a contribution to CUS is discretionary but not arbitrary. What warrants inclusion of any given work is a function of whether it meets Williams’ three criteria, but also whether it takes its cues from the academy’s troubling reconstitution within a neoliberal political economy. CUS thereby reprises the literature of protest’s preoccupation with the university’s capitalist capture but does so within a regime of accumulation that more effectively subordinates the academy to its imperatives.

In Upton Sinclair’s muckraking contribution to the literature of protest, *The Goose Step: A Study of American Education* (1923, 23), the university is represented as a site that joins the “headquarters of our plutocratic empire” to “the headquarters of our plutocratic education.” According to Sinclair (1923, 455), professors are “intellectual proletarians who have nothing but their brain power to sell.” Their pupils, reared on the specious gospel of meritocracy, “throw themselves into the social struggle with fero-

cious determination to get ahead; and when they go out into the world, they carry that spirit into the commercial struggle” (Sinclair 1923, 379). Mirroring this trio of concerns, Williams (2012) argues that the best CUS scholarship to date has (1) “condemned the rise of ‘academic capitalism’ and the corporatization of the university;” (2) focused on “the deteriorating conditions of academic labor”; and (3) “pointed out the problems of students,” including but not limited to their “escalating debt.”

To begin with commodification of the academy’s goods, the universities that housed contributors to the literature of protest specialized in generating technical expertise in chemistry, engineering, and other sciences that was then applied to industrial and agricultural endeavors via time and motion studies, extension programs, and the like. Within a neoliberal political economy, however, what we persist in calling “knowledge” is reconstituted as an intrinsic factor of production as the university itself becomes an essential agent of capital accumulation (Jessop 2017; Tuchman 2009). Avant la lettre, this is the ground prepared for CUS by Larry Leslie, Sheila Slaughter, and Gary Rhoades (Slaughter and Leslie 1997; Slaughter and Rhoades 2004) who identified many of the means by which the fruits of scholarly inquiry are converted into so much cognitive capital, including intellectual property policies, university licensing contracts with for-profit corporations, public-private partnerships that undo the academy’s pretension to autonomy, and modes of technology transfer that ease the slide of inventions and discoveries from the academy into the marketplace, domestic as well as global (Cantwell and Kauppinen 2014; Münch 2014; Rooksby 2016).

In the lexicon of CUS, commodification’s kin include “commercialization” and “corporatization.” Within the literature of protest, complaints about commercialization chiefly targeted the diversion of funds that should be dedicated to academic programs: “Advertising looms large,” grumbled one, as an ever-greater proportion of institutional resources is devoted to enticing students “towards the local Athenopolis and away from the rival one” (Jastrow 1913, 340–41). The march of neoliberalism, however, has seen commercialization burrow far more deeply into the academy’s entrails as varsity athletes become mobile Nike logos, “schol-

ars” become profiteering “entrepreneurs,” and campus operations are outsourced to for-profit providers whose interests are antithetical to those of the academy (Bok 2003; McGettigan 2013). Together, insist CUS scholars, these instances of commercialization undercut any sense of higher education as a public good whose value should be measured not by U.S. News & World Report, but by its contribution to our capacity to recognize that such goods do in fact exist (Brown 2015; Newfield 2007; Tuchman 2009).

While “corporatization” is a catch-all epithet, within CUS, this term typically points to the academy’s adoption of the articulations of instrumental rationality that prevail within capitalist firms (Washburn 2006; Wesley 1997). The literature of protest condemned efforts to “determine the efficiency of the university in terms of number of student hours per instructor, percentage of passes and failures, percentage of utilization of plant, and quantity of productive work” (Leighton 1920, 369). Within a neoliberal political economy, these efforts intensify via adoption of digital technologies that measure (and often surveil) faculty work as well as online learning programs that precisely appraise student “success.” So, too, CUS scholars argue, capitalism’s reason can be detected in performance-based budgeting, data analytics, dashboards of key indicators, and, perhaps most insidious, citation metrics that enable scholars to engage in everyday calculation of their own value.

Turning to the academic workforce, according to the literature of protest, the debilitating relationship between the university’s rulers and their faculty was one of “high-priced imperious management and low-priced docile labor” (Jastrow 1913, 326). In response, the American Association of University Professors, founded in 1915, pressed for the faculty’s professionalization as well as its rightful prerogatives: tenure, academic freedom, and shared governance. A century later, perhaps best exemplified by Marc Bousquet’s *How the University Works* (2008), CUS scholarship traces this project’s demise. The faculty’s “de-professionalization” is marked by evisceration of the perquisites that once distinguished higher education faculty from lower status workers but now compromise the academy’s capacity to respond with “agility” to whatever a neoliberal political economy demands of it today

(Johnson, Kavanagh, and Mattson 2003). It is in these terms that CUS reads the reduction of tenure-eligible positions to a fraction of the academic workforce and their displacement by contingent employees, most often part-time, within what Adrianna Kezar and her co-authors call the “gig academy” (Kezar, DePaola, and Scott 2019; see also Ginsberg 2011).

Lastly, consider the faculty’s charges. The literature of protest harbored few illusions about the *raison d’être* of students, as Sinclair made clear when he noted that presidents envision them chiefly as future donors (1923, 363–70). CUS scholarship, however, redefines students by locating them within an academy that is now irrevocably dependent on a form of capitalism whose financialization renders money a medium of exchange as well as an instrument of credit but also a direct source of profit.

The capacity of money to beget capital absent the production of goods, unrecognized by Sinclair and his cohorts, explains CUS’s concern with student debt (Goldrick-Raab 2016; Ross 2014). Indebtedness extends capitalism’s exploitation through time via what Williams calls a new form of “indentured servitude” (2008). That yoke moves beyond figuring students as conspicuous consumers and, instead, constructs them as so many opportunities for investment. This serfdom’s neoliberal incarnation is consummated when students come to regard themselves as so much human capital and their education as an investment in their own worth as measured by future earnings (Williams 2006). Thus do enterprising students taught by entrepreneurial faculty, themselves ruled by masters of finance, co-create an academy that no longer knows how to distinguish the practice of education from the pursuit of economic gain (Cowden and Singh 2013).

Williams’s 2012 announcement of the birth of Critical University Studies was retrospective insofar as it gave a name to two decades of scholarship whose authors did not consider themselves contributors to this endeavor. But that declaration was also a performative act aimed at creating a “gathering place for those considering similar work” (Williams 2012). That place has now become institutionalized, as signified by several book series published by academic presses under this title, including one by Johns Hopkins University Press (2015) and another by Palgrave (n.d.). CUS

thereby becomes embedded within the material means of intellectual production, and so finds itself implicated in networks of power that extend well beyond the academy.

This entanglement renders CUS vulnerable, but also makes more urgent its call to fulfill the purpose that defines it: to illuminate but also to contest “the ways in which current practices serve power or wealth and contribute to injustice or inequality rather than social hope” (Williams 2012). Worthy of note in this regard are several open access journals hospitable to CUS scholarship, including *Workplace: A Journal for Academic Labor* (see, especially, Petrina and Ross 2014) and *Radical Teacher* (see, especially, Samuels 2017), but also the blog, “Remaking the University” (Newfield and Meranze 2007), which seeks to reclaim higher education from the regime of austerity that neoliberalism manufactures to justify defunding the academy (Fabricant and Brier 2016).

Each of these enterprises, Williams tells us, presupposes a rejection of any scholarship that represents the academy as “a neutral institution for the public good” and its replacement by inquiry that “foregrounds its politics” (Williams 2012). If this reorientation has merit, political science’s failure to play a vital role offers a damning critique of the discipline. We might therefore ask what political science can bring to CUS or, better still, what a critical political science might offer this project, especially given recent discussions about the academy’s reproduction of multiple structures of oppression as well as what it might mean to decolonize higher education (Arndt and Mika 2018; Ferguson 2012; Bhambra, Nisancioglu, and Gebrial 2018). Given political science’s disinclination to study higher education, however, perhaps it makes more sense to flip this question and ask instead what CUS might bring to political science, critical or otherwise.

One of the most striking features of CUS’s progenitor, the literature of protest, was its employment of explicitly political categories to characterize the academy but also to imagine its future. Contributors to that literature routinely branded the *fin de siècle* academy an “autocracy” and proffered a vision of it as a self-governing republic or, as Cattell (1913a, 62) put it, “a democracy of scholars serving the larger democracy of which it is a part.”

Were this ideal to be adopted, that would require political science to quit its lingering love affair with positivism, but also its devotion to a professional identity that is ungrounded in the material conditions of its work. That self-representation, declaimed Sinclair, is but a cover for a “feeling of class superiority” (1923, 455) that renders faculty loath to identify as and with other workers and hence to form associations, like unions, committed to asserting a claim to political power. Doing so, he insisted, the professoriate positions its members as so many “fat rabbits to the plutocracy” (1923, 455). Sinclair’s heir, Critical University Studies, dares political science to abandon its epistemological and professional conceits and instead define its work as an integral but ultimately subordinate contributor to the project of realizing freedom within but also without the university.

TIMOTHY V. KAUFMAN-OSBORN

References

- Arndt, Sonja and Carl Mika. 2018. “Dissident Thought: A Decolonising Framework for Revolt in the University.” In *The Thinking University: A Philosophical Examination of Thought and Higher Education*, edited by Søren S. E. Bengtsen and Ronald Barnett, 47–60. New York, NY: Springer.
- American Political Science Association. 2020. “APSA Welcomes New Organized Sections: Civic Engagement and Education Politics and Policy.” <https://politicalsciencenow.com/apsa-welcomes-new-organized-sections-civic-engagement-and-education-politics-and-policy/>.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 1990. *Universities and the Capitalist State: Corporate Liberalism and the Reconstruction of American Higher Education, 1894–1928*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Bhambra, Gurinder K., Kerem Nisancioglu, and Dalia Gebrial, eds. 2018. *Decolonizing the University*. London: Pluto Press.
- Bousquet, Marc. 2008. *How the University Works: Higher Education and the Low-Wage Nation*. New York: New York University Press.
- Brown, Wendy. 2015. “Educating Human Capital.” In *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism’s Stealth Revolution*, 175–200. New York: Zone Books.
- Cantwell, Brandan, and Ilkka Kauppinen, eds. 2014. *Academic Capitalism in the Age of Globalization*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University.
- Cattell, J. McKeen, ed. 1913a. *University Control*. New York: The Science Press.
- Cattell, J. McKeen. 1913b. “University Control.” In *University Control*, 1–62. New York and Garrison, N.Y.: The Science Press.
- Cowden, Stephen and Gurnam Singh. 2013. *Acts of Knowing: Critical Pedagogy In Against and Beyond the University*. New York: Bloomsbury.
- Fabricant, Michael and Stephen Brier. 2016. *Austerity Blues: Fighting for the Soul of Public Education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Ferguson, Roderick. 2012. *The Reorder of Things: The University and its Pedagogies of Minority Difference*. Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press.
- Gift, Thomas and Erik Wibbels. 2014. “Reading, Writing, and the Regrettable Status of Education Research in Comparative Politics.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 17: 291–312.
- Ginsberg, B. 2011. *The Fall of the Faculty: The Rise of the All-Administrative University and Why It Matters*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Goldrick-Rab, Sara. 2016. *College Costs, Financial Aid, and the Betrayal of the American Dream*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jastrow, Joseph. 1908. “Academic Aspects of Administration.” *Popular Science Monthly* 73 (October): 326–39.
- Jastrow, Joseph. 1913. “The Administrative Peril in Education.” In Cattell J. McKeen, *University Control*, 315–48. New York: The Science Press.
- Jessop, B. 2017. “Varieties of Academic Capitalism and Entrepreneurial Universities.” *Higher Education* 73: 6 (February): 853–70.
- Johns Hopkins University Press. 2015. “Critical University Studies.” <https://jhupbooks.press.jhu.edu/series/critical-university-studies>.
- Johnson, Benjamin, Patrick Kavanagh, and Kevin Mattson, eds. 2003. *Steal This University: The Rise of the Corporate University and an Academic Labor Movement*. New York: Routledge.
- Kezar, Adrianna, Tom DePaola, and Daniel T. Scott. 2019. *The Gig Academy: Mapping Labor in the Neoliberal University*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Leighton, Joseph A. 1920. “University Government.” *Educational Review* 60 (December): 363–75.
- McGettigan, Andrew. 2013. *The Great University Gamble: Money, Markets and the Future of Higher Education*. London: Pluto Press.
- McLendon, Michael K. 2003. “Toward an Expanded Research Agenda.” *Educational Policy* 17:1 (January and March): 165–91.
- Münch, R. 2014. *Academic Capitalism: Universities in the Global Struggle for Excellence*. London: Routledge.
- Newfield, Christopher. 2007. *Unmaking the Public University: The Forty-Year Assault on the Middle Class*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Newfield, Christopher. 2016. *The Great Mistake: How We Wrecked Public Universities and How We Can Fix Them*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Newfield, Christopher and Michael Meranze, eds. 2007. *Remaking the University*. <http://utotherescue.blogspot.com/>.
- Palgrave Critical University Studies. n.d. www.springer.com/series/14707.
- Petrina, Stephen and E. Wayne Ross. 2014. "Critical University Studies: Workplace, Milestones, Crossroads, Respect, Truth." *Workplace* 23 (January): 62–72.
- Rooksby, Jacob H. 2016. *Branding of the American Mind: How Universities Capture, Manage, and Monetize Intellectual Property and Why It Matters*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Ross, Andrew. 2014. *Creditocracy and the Case for Debt Refusal*. New York: OR Books.
- Samuels, Robert, ed. 2017. "Introduction: Teaching Critical University Studies." *Radical Teacher* 108 (May): 1–4. <https://radicalteacher.library.pitt.edu/ojs/radicalteacher/issue/view/13/19>.
- Sinclair, Upton. 1923. *The Goose-Step: A Study of American Education*, rev. edn. Los Angeles: Privately Published.
- Slaughter, Sheila and Larry L. Leslie. 1997. *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University.
- Slaughter, Sheila and Gary Rhoades. 2004. *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Tuchman, G. 2009. *Wannabe U: Inside the Corporate University*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Veblen, Thorstein. 2015. *The Higher Learning in America: A Memorandum on the Conduct of Universities by Business Men*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Washburn, Jennifer. 2006. *University, Inc.: The Corporate Corruption of American Higher Education*. New York: Basic Books.
- Wesley, Shumar. 1997. *College for Sale: A Critique of the Commodification of Higher Education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Williams, Jeffrey J. 2006. "The Pedagogy of Debt." *College Literature* 33:4 (Fall): 155–69.
- Williams, Jeffrey. 2008. "Student Debt and the Spirit of Indenture." *Dissent* 55:4 (Fall): 73–8.
- Williams, Jeffrey J. 2012. "Deconstructing Academe: The Birth of Critical University Studies." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (February 19).

See also

Intellectuals; Disciplinary History; Clyde W. Barrow; Ideology; Ideology Critique

29. Critique of intellectuals

Etymology is not history, but the term “intellectual” emerged from the Dreyfus Affair that beset France at the end of the nineteenth century (1894). In the Dreyfus Affair, the army framed a Jewish army officer (Alfred Dreyfus) as a spy. Under the leadership of the novelist Emile Zola, a group of writers and scholars came together to protest this miscarriage of justice. Those who defended the army and the state dubbed these writers “the intellectuals” as an insult. They accused the intellectuals of meddling in domains outside their competence. However, the term was adopted by those so targeted as a badge of honor as it suggested that intellectuals stand up for justice and rights against the powers-that-be.

The Dreyfus Affair has colored virtually all discussion of intellectuals – and distorted those discussions. Many observers concluded from the French situation that intellectuals subsist only on the left as critics and rebels against the established political order. This is not an accurate view of intellectuals, because intellectuals have been found in all political camps. Intellectuals are not simply dissidents, but also apologists for the established political order. Intellectuals can be found on the left and the right of the political spectrum. Intellectuals have also been imperialists, nationalists, and fascists. Two examples suffice to illustrate this observation. In 1914, a group of German writers and professors published an open letter, the so-called “Manifesto of the Ninety-Three,” that defended German military actions at the beginning of World War I. In 1925, numerous Italian writers and professors signed the “Manifesto of Fascist Intellectuals” in support of Benito Mussolini and the Italian state (Noether 1971, 640–41).

While intellectuals have not historically leaned left, the role of intellectuals has occupied the left far more than the right. For conservatives, the place of intellectuals is relatively unproblematic: intellectuals defend traditional learning and values, and sometimes church and state. For leftists, however, the role of intellectuals is both charged and contradictory: intellectuals are the products of a society they wish to change. They are

often beneficiaries of a society they oppose, so how to resolve this contradiction?

If intellectuals are defined as the learned or the scholars, they are as old as written civilization – as old as the philosophers that Plato privileged in *The Republic*. But it is more precise to characterize them in the West as a social-economic grouping, literary persons of the coffee shops in England and philosophes of the salons in France that coalesced with the emergence of a reading public at the end of the eighteenth-century Europe. For the first time, writers could subsist financially, who were not beholden to the patronage of princes, aristocrats, or the Church. Over the course of the nineteenth century, this grouping became increasingly conscious of its own role in society; the intelligentsia of Eastern Europe and Russia, and the intellectuals of Western Europe. One benchmark of this new self-awareness was the work of the utopian socialist Henri de St. Simon (1760–1825), whose theories elevated scientists and scholars to leaders of a new society.

The advent of intellectuals spurred discussions that typically followed two paths: an empirical and a moral one, to wit, do intellectuals constitute a distinct group and do (or should) they play a specific role in society. These paths overlapped inasmuch as the empirical argument implied or declared a normative one. Some Marxists viewed intellectuals as brain workers. Intellectuals were simply workers who specialized in intellectual production. Such an approach implied that intellectuals shared the interests and politics of the proletariat. Other Marxists saw intellectuals as part of the bourgeoisie and, therefore, bourgeois in outlook and politically untrustworthy. The Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci (1971, 3) put the problem concisely (although he did not answer it concisely): “Are intellectuals an autonomous and independent social group, or does every social group have its own particular specialized category of intellectuals?”

Thus, a dual, if not contradictory, position runs through the Marxist tradition on intellectuals. On the one hand, Marxism was the product of intellectuals; after all, Marx himself was a student and a scholar. Marxism depended on intellectuals to educate, to understand, and to lead politically and ideologically. On the other hand, insofar as intellectuals emerged from the bourgeoisie, they were not politically reliable and had to

prove their loyalty by submerging themselves in the working class. Hence, a suspicion of intellectuals marks the entire orthodox Marxist tradition.

Marxists, beginning with Marx, wrestled with the problem that they both needed and distrusted intellectuals. Marx (2010 [1848], 494) alluded to the issue in the *Communist Manifesto*, where he states that one segment of the bourgeoisie, presumably intellectuals, “cuts itself adrift and joins the revolutionary class.” Major theorists from Karl Kautsky to Vladimir Lenin indicated that Marxism, which they considered a science, was the creation of intellectuals and not the working class. “Modern socialist consciousness,” declared Kautsky, “can only arise on the basis of profound scientific knowledge ... The vehicles of science are not the proletariat but the bourgeois intelligentsia” (Gleberzon 1978, 86). But these same intellectuals needed to subordinate themselves to the cause of working-class emancipation. Lenin’s (1969 [1902]) theory of the revolutionary party as presented in *What is To Be Done?* turned on this same notion. Intellectuals, who were essential to the development of socialist working-class consciousness, could overcome their bourgeois origins by joining the working-class party and melding with workers.

But might intellectuals be neither part of the bourgeoisie nor proletariat, but instead constitute their own class with their own interests? This problem has vexed leftist commentators, who have offered competing analyses of this question. Alvin Gouldner, in *The Future of the Intellectuals and the Rise of the New Class* (1979), argued that intellectuals formed a potentially independent progressive force. Others have argued the opposite position that intellectuals constitute a self-promoting group or a dominating elite. Anarchists were probably the first to advance this idea and they advanced it against Marx and his supporters. Bakunin condemned Marxism as a system designed to lead not to a free union of peoples, but to a dictatorial rule by a “learned minority.” Perhaps influenced by Bakunin, the Polish revolutionary Jan Wacław Machajski (and his sometime American follower, Max Nomad) developed the idea that intellectuals constituted a new and oppressive class. As his biographer put it, Machajski came to believe that Marxism “represented the class interests not of the

workers but of a rising new class – the intelligentsia ... who sought a profitable accommodation for themselves with the capitalist order” (Shatz 1989, 18).

Machajski’s theory, which was criticized by Leon Trotsky, would show up in various forms, often as a denunciation of Soviet regimes as a system run by intellectuals and bureaucrats; for instance, in the books by the Italian Marxist, Bruno Rizzi, *The Bureaucratization of the World* (1939), the Yugoslavian dissident, Milovan Djilas’s *The New Class* (1957), and later by the Hungarians George Konrad and Ivan Szeleni, *The Intellectuals on the Road to Class Power* (1973–5). In a different register, the Polish poet Czesław Miłosz’s *The Captive Mind* (1953) assailed intellectuals (or philosophers) as the key players in the Soviet Eastern European regimes. Its opening sentence reads: “It was only toward the middle of the twentieth century that the inhabitants of many European countries came, in general unpleasantly, to the realization that their fate could be influenced directly by intricate and abstruse books of philosophy” (Miłosz 1981, 3).

A more positive interpretation of intellectuals can be found in the writings of the Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci and the refugee sociologist Karl Mannheim. Gramsci drew a distinction between traditional and organic intellectuals. The former pretended to fly above society and speak in universal terms. The latter were rooted in specific classes, such as the proletariat. Gramsci called for organic intellectuals to aid the working class attain socialist class consciousness. To use his vocabulary, the organic intellectuals of the proletariat would challenge the ideological hegemony of the bourgeoisie.

Mannheim turned Marxism upon itself with the claim that all social knowledge, or all ideology, is produced by groups, including Marxism, which could be considered the ideology of the proletariat. The problem for Mannheim, however, was that if all knowledge is ideological, how is one to weigh the knowledge claims of competing ideologies? In *Ideology and Utopia* (1936), Mannheim declared that intellectuals are the answer because they are the only group in society that is “socially unattached” and “relatively classless.” As socially unattached or “free-floating” intellectuals, they can view the whole society and attain a non-ideological synthesis.

If this seemed to elevate the role of intellectuals, for some Marxists, especially those connected to the Frankfurt School, Mannheim neutered intellectuals and eviscerated the notion of ideology. T.W. Adorno of the Frankfurt School charged that Mannheim's intellectuals no longer committed themselves to the critique of ideology but as "free floating" intellectuals merely assessed divergent perspectives. Mannheim transformed "dialectical concepts into classificatory ones" and provided a benign academic refuge for "the homeless intelligentsia." For Adorno, in "The Sociology of Knowledge and its Consciousness," the critique of ideology rested on the notion of truth, the lifeblood of intellectuals. However, Mannheim had turned the critique of ideology into a new field of study – the sociology of knowledge – and intellectuals into mere consultants (Adorno 1967, 35–50).

This idea of truth, shared by Marxists and non-Marxists, infused one tradition of intellectuals from the Dreyfus Affair to the present. It puts aside the issues of whether intellectuals should join a political party or constitute a social class and accents their role as truth-tellers. This assumption shines through, for instance, Noam Chomsky's "The Responsibility of Intellectuals" (1968), where he denounced intellectuals who defended the American war in Vietnam. Chomsky declared that "it is the responsibility of intellectuals to speak the truth and to expose lies." The Chomsky text also evidences a neo-anarchist legacy that reaches back to Bakunin and Machejski inasmuch as it expressed a disdain for intellectuals who serve power. "A good case can be made," wrote Chomsky (1969, 348) that the "scholar-experts" who function as administrators of the welfare state have given up truth for success and plaudits from those they serve.

The Chomsky essay can be situated within a tradition that denounces intellectuals who have sold out truth for power. It looks back to Randolph Bourne's "War and the Intellectuals" (1917) and forward to Tony Judt's "Bush's Useful Idiots" (2006). Bourne denounced American intellectuals who defended the United States joining World War I. For Bourne, these intellectuals had given up reason for nationalism. "The results of the war on the intellectual class," he wrote, "are already apparent." The intellectuals offer little more than "justification

of what is going on" (Bourne 1964, 3–14). Judt similarly assailed the intellectuals who defended President George Bush's attack on Iraq. "Liberal intellectuals are fast becoming a service class," wrote Judt (2006). In the past, liberal intellectuals upheld universal values, but now they have become apologists for the state and, like Bourne, Judt closed his essay by calling upon intellectuals not to second conventional wisdom, but to disturb the cultural consensus.

For Chomsky the requirement that intellectuals speak the truth to power was a "truism." However, the mode of speaking truth can itself be scrutinized. Russell Jacoby's *The Last Intellectuals* (1987) addressed this issue and put the term "public intellectual" on the map; a term that has since spurred wide discussion among intellectuals. For Jacoby, the category "public intellectual," which might seem redundant, was necessary because of the professionalization or academization of intellectuals in the late twentieth century. The term sought to underscore what was once implicit, but now must be spelled out: the commitment of intellectuals to public discourse. Public intellectuals are counterposed to other kinds of intellectuals – academic, professional, or technical – whose work draws them into specialized arenas and away from public obligations.

Jacoby's book focused on "public intellectuals," or those he called "writers and thinkers who address a general and educated audience." He offered a generational analysis of the relative disappearance of such figures in contemporary society. Jacoby took three generations: (1) a 1900 generation which included people such as Edmund Wilson and Lewis Mumford, (2) a 1920 generation consisting of New York intellectuals like Daniel Bell and Irving Howe, and (3) a 1940 or post-World War II generation. He argued that the decline of small magazines that had been the life blood of earlier intellectuals, the gentrification of cities that dispersed urban bohemia, and the vast expansion of higher education herded the post-World War II generation into universities in a way that has transformed cultural life.

The Wilsons and Mumfords had kept their distance from universities. The 1920, or transitional generation, often became professors late in life after careers in freelance writing and editing and, sometimes like Alfred Kazin or Daniel Bell, without graduate training

or degrees. This New York generation preserved its identity as public intellectuals inasmuch as it generally wrote lucidly for an educated public. The post-World War II generation, however, never really left the university; it graduated from college students to graduate students to assistant professors. As the possibilities for careers as independent intellectuals diminished, this generation became by necessity or inclination full-time professionals and lost the desire, and sometimes the ability, to address a wider public. They directed their work towards academic fields and subfields. Ironically, according to Jacoby, the rebellious sixties intellectuals became more academic than earlier American thinkers. They became radical sociologists, Marxist historians, feminist theorists, but not quite public intellectuals.

Jacoby's reference point was the United States, but he indicated elsewhere that the same tendencies exist in other Western countries. The transition in France from Albert Camus to Jacques Derrida, in Germany from Max Horkheimer to Jürgen Habermas and Albrecht Wellmer, or in England from E.P. Thompson to Gareth Stedman Jones evidences similar forces at work. The later figures expressed a more cramped politics, vision, and writing than that of the earlier generation. The issue was not simply who was or was not a professor – E.P. Thompson and Horkheimer taught in universities – but how they approached their work and the public.

For instance, in the United States, C. Wright Mills was a radical sociology professor, but he saw himself as someone writing for a larger public. Indeed, in *The Sociological Imagination* (1959), Mills lampooned the jargon and arid theorizing of the leading sociologist of the day such as Talcott Parsons (1951). He has been succeeded by hundreds, if not thousands, of leftist sociology professors, but they lack the reach and public profile of Mills. As an illustration of this point, Jacoby pointed to Erik Olin Wright, a Marxist sociologist who achieved the high honor of president of the American Sociology Association, but who wrote insular texts for professional sociologists that were completely inaccessible to a public audience (Jacoby 2011).

Jacoby's book elicited a slew of responses that continue to the present day. Undeniably, the book touched a chord because the wide-

spread use of the term "public intellectual" dates from the publication of *The Last Intellectuals*. While the term "public intellectual" appeared in passing in Mills, who died in 1962, Ngram graphs of its usage show a dramatic take off after 1987 after Jacoby published *The Last Intellectuals*. Nevertheless, critics made several points about the book. Some charged that Jacoby inflated the role of earlier American intellectuals, who were mainly male, white, and elitist and, at the same time, he unfairly depreciated contemporary academic intellectuals, who are closer to popular culture, more racially heterogeneous, and more culturally savvy than their predecessors. From this perspective, Jacoby was guilty of nostalgia and missed the cultural advances of the last decades. Versions of this position have been taken by Andrew Ross in *No Respect: Intellectuals and Popular Culture* (1989) and Bruce Robbins in *Intellectuals: Aesthetics, Politics, Academics* (1990).

Ross argued that the "universal intellectual" (or public intellectual) belongs to the past and has been replaced by the "professional intellectual," who occupies multiple "sites" and challenges disciplinary "codes." He criticized what he calls "romantic left narratives about the 'decline of the public intellectual'." Ross's line of criticism took its inspiration from the postmodern thought of Michel Foucault. From this perspective, public intellectuals wrote in the dubious name of universals, while the newer academic intellectuals armed themselves with concepts appropriate to smaller battles. In the same vein, Paul R. Gorman in *Left Intellectuals and Popular Culture* (1996) faults earlier public intellectuals as elitists, who held simplistic ideas about mass culture that suggested that people are manipulated. According to Gorman, the new academic intellectuals have reached a much more positive appreciation of the "complicated relationship" between mass entertainment and its audience.

Other critics argue that teaching itself is a public activity and, for this reason, academic intellectuals deserve to be labeled publicly engaged. Some observers defend the academization of intellectuals as a positive phenomenon because it subjects previously irresponsible intellectuals to the rigors of professional scrutiny. This is partly Richard Posner's argument in *Public Intellectuals* (2001) where he turns Jacoby upside down.

Subtitled "A Study of Decline," Posner tries to show statistically that tenured academics fail when they join public discussions outside their expertise. For Posner, who celebrates the rationality of the free market, tenured academics do not suffer financial consequences for their faulty public interventions. A few critics indicate that the decline of public intellectuals, who have generally been on the left, corresponds to the world-wide decline of the political left. Still others note that Jacoby simply misses younger public intellectuals, who are everywhere. "A well-stroked three-wood aimed out my Brooklyn window," claimed one aggrieved critic, "could easily hit half a dozen" public intellectuals (Perlstein 2002).

Another line of criticism posits that classic public intellectuals have vanished in the same way – and for the same reason – as typewriters. The Internet has refashioned intellectual life for the better. A New York-centric world of small magazines belongs to the past. The Internet allows everyone to contribute to intellectual life. The essayist who struggles to get an essay published has been supplanted by the blogger who posts opinions at will. With Internet-driven venues new intellectuals pop up everywhere. Daniel W. Drezner takes this tack and offers an ebullient account of the emergence of new public intellectuals. "The growth of blogs and other forms of online writing" declares Drezner have "stimulated rather than retarded the quality and diversity of public intellectuals" (Drezner 2008). Or as two Australian scholars have put it: "In this new online space, we are seeing a new generation of public intellectuals who have some facility in producing and presenting themselves" (Marshall and Atherton 2015, 73).

Are these critics right? One example: the podcast "Public Intellectual" by the writer Jessa Crispin suggests the Internet does open avenues. But Crispin herself had complained about the cacophony of Twitter, Facebook, and blogging, and has written old-fashioned books published by mainstream presses. With all the shifts and controversies one dictum remains a constant for intellectuals: a commitment to truth, public prose, and cultural disruption.

RUSSELL JACOBY

References

- Adorno, T.W. 1967. *Prisms*, translated by S. & S. Weber. London: Neville Spearman
- Bourne, Randolph S. 1964. *War and the Intellectuals: Collected Essays, 1915–1919*, edited by Carl Resek. New York: Harper & Row.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1969. "The Responsibility of Intellectuals." In *American Power and The New Mandarins*, by Noam Chomsky. New York: Pantheon.
- Drezner, Daniel W. 2008. "Public Intellectuals 2.0." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 14.
- Gleberzon, William. 1978. "Marxist Conceptions of the Intellectuals." *Historical Reflections / Réflexions Historiques*, Vol. 5, No. 1: 81–97.
- Gorman, Paul R. 1996. *Left Intellectuals & Popular Culture in Twentieth-Century America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. "The Intellectuals." In *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Translated and Edited by Q. Hoare and G. N. Smith, 3–23. New York: International Publishers.
- Jacoby, Russell. 1987. *The Last Intellectuals: American Culture in the Age of Academe*. New York: Basic Books.
- Jacoby, Russell. 2011. "Real Men Find Real Utopias." *Dissent* (Winter). Available at Real Men Find Real Utopias - Dissent Magazine.
- Judt, Tony. 2006. "Bush's Useful Idiots." *London Review of Books* 28, no. 18, September 21. Available at Tony Judt · Bush's Useful Idiots: Whatever happened to American liberalism? · LRB 21 September 2006.
- Lenin, V. I. 1969 [1902]. *What is to be Done? Burning Questions of Our Movement*. New York: International Publishers.
- Mannheim, Karl. 1936. *Ideology and Utopia*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
- Marshall, David and Cassandra Atherton. 2015. "Situating Public Intellectuals." *Media International Australia*, August 2015: 69–78.
- Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. 2010 [1848]. "The Communist Manifesto." In *Marx-Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 6, 477–519. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Milosz, Czeslaw. 1981. *The Captive Mind*. Translated by Jane Zielonko. New York: Vintage Books.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1959. *The Sociological Imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Noether, Emiliana. 1971. "Italian Intellectuals under Fascism." *Journal of Modern History* 43, no. 3: 630–48.
- Parsons, Talcott. 1951. *The Social System*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Perlstein, Rick. 2002. "Thinkers in Need of Publishers." *New York Times*, January 22.
- Posner, Richard A. 2001. *Public Intellectuals: A Study of Decline*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Robbins, Bruce, ed. 1990. *Intellectuals: Aesthetics, Politics, Academics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ross, Andrew. 1989. *No Respect: Intellectuals & Popular Culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Shatz, Marshall S. 1989. *Jan Wacław Machajski: A Radical Critic of the Russian Intelligentsia and Socialism*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Further readings

- Brick, Howard 2011. "C. Wright Mills, Sociology, and the Politics of the Public Intellectual." *Modern Intellectual History*, v. 8, 2: 391–409.
- Coser, Lewis. 1965. *Men of Ideas*. New York: Free Press.
- Said, Edward. 1994. *Representations of the Intellectual*. New York: Pantheon Books.

30. Critical legal studies

In the late 1970s, a diverse group of leftist lawyers, law students, and legal scholars came together to form the critical legal studies (CLS) movement. Over the course of a little more than a decade – roughly between 1977 and 1990 – these ‘Crits’ organized dozens of conferences, debates, reading groups, and summer camps, and they produced one of the most provocative academic-led movements in American legal history. During their heyday, the Crits boldly attempted to remake the professional legal consciousness that underwrote American legal institutions and practices. To accomplish this, Crits engaged in political activism and university reform efforts to transform curricula, pedagogy, student learning outcomes, legal scholarship, and the future of lawyering in the United States.

Within the American legal academy, this heterodox movement became the most popular leftist alternative to law-and-economics and liberal legalist schools of thought. CLS also embodied youth and novelty in the legal profession, and the movement became identified with a fierce generational and ideological conflict that marked life within American law schools during the 1970s and 1980s. This controversial movement had its fair share of detractors, which weakened CLS by the end of the 1980s. According to some on the political right, the Crits needed to be marginalized because they threatened the very foundations of legal education and the broader legal system. Additionally, a variety of new leftist groups within the academy confronted CLS during the second half of the 1980s. For example, critical race scholars and feminist legal scholars drew on legal insights and perspectives that had emerged within CLS, but also seriously challenged Crits’ scholarly work and political ambitions (Baumgardner 2021).

Far from a flash in the pan, CLS represents a historic movement of leftists whose experiences and aspirations should inspire new generations of radical scholars. The American political science discipline, in particular, has a rich history of engaging and developing research currents, methodological commitments, and ideological agendas from the legal academy (Whittington 2000; Rosenberg 2000; Cameron and Kornhauser

2005). The activist left of modern political science should continue participating in these interdisciplinary exchanges, but for more than bookish reasons. The Crits provide a valuable model for the future of critical political science, by demonstrating how leftists within an academic discipline can build strength within their professional environment and then wield power in the service of progressive institutional reconstruction.

But what would a CLS intervention in political science actually look like? What would ‘CLS as critical political science’ entail for today’s scholars? Beyond the chronological and disciplinary divides separating the Crits from present-day political scientists, there also are noteworthy perspectival divides to consider. The CLS movement included a broad array of theoretical perspectives (and corresponding praxes). Throughout the turbulent 1980s, different Crits expounded powerful Marxist, structuralist, post-structuralist, existentialist, deconstructionist, feminist, and phenomenological analyses of the American legal system. However, in spite of the remarkable theoretical diversity that existed across CLS, the Crits nurtured several core commitments that anchored the movement as it engaged in consequential struggles across law schools for more than a decade.

This entry examines the Crits’ core commitments to subversive scholarship, to office activism, and to the creation of a community of humane teachers and learners. These commitments supply meaningful lessons and also offer encouragement to the heterogeneous leftwing working within political science today.

Scholarship

The Crits became notorious for their production of scholarship that both centered the role of critique within the mainstream of the discipline and also directly attacked the features of the discipline that reproduced undemocratic tendencies, illegitimate hierarchies, and injustices in American society. For example, the Crits wrote voluminously about the political complacency and social contentment of their older liberal colleagues, who had become the entrenched elite of the legal academy. These liberal barons were responsible for governing many leading law schools during the 1970s and 1980s and were setting professional standards both for

their own schools and also for lower-tiered law schools. The Crits spilled much ink detailing how these barons were terrified of rocking the boat and why they were standing in the way of progressive attempts to restructure legal education (Kennedy 1982; Hutchinson 1989; Austin 1998; Baumgardner 2021). CLS also pushed back against the growing conservative tide within the discipline. Crits published numerous law review articles and books that disputed the findings and countered the doctrinal arguments of conservative legal scholars and judges associated with the Federalist Society and the law-and-economics movement.

It is important to note that the Crits' infamous scholarship – from controversial “trashings” to deviationist doctrine-making – was not designed to generate an idealized form of depoliticized “reason” or “academic neutrality” (Kelman 1984; Tushnet 1980; Freeman and Schlegel 1985; Hutchinson 1987; Gordon 1996; Unger 2015; Kennedy 1985). As the modern political science discipline places increasing faith in the ability of quantitative methodologies and formal modeling to furnish objective and neutral analyses of political phenomena, the Crits' scholarly practices are instructive. Leading Crits challenged positivist research and mocked the ways in which the legal academy feigned objectivity. These challenges were met with resistance, as law schools manufactured “new ways to describe and justify the law as natural or neutral, and maintain the image of neutrality by suppressing critical scholarship that might challenge the professional story” (Trubek 1990, 15).

The Crits' scholarship holds out an essential lesson for critical political scientists today. Crits' writings were especially trenchant both towards those who believed that scholarship must avoid the taint of ideology or advocacy and also towards academics who were blind to the ideological consequences of research decisions. Although the presentation and proof of depoliticization can be deemed necessary features of quality scholarship and of well-developed academic environments, the virtue of political distance is no virtue at all. Instead, academics should embrace the fact that scholarship can be used to legitimate diverse, competing political interests, and moral agendas. Unlike many legal scholars and social scientists, Crits were willing to openly exploit this malleability and contin-

gency for the advancement of certain ideological ends. A founder of CLS, David Trubek, explained:

I want us to stop thinking of ourselves as white-coated experts who command a specialized and purer knowledge which we produce for no end except the truth, and to recognize that we are moral and political actors engaged in a process of social transformation and struggle. I want us to acknowledge our visions and commitments openly and to bear the individual and collective responsibility such acknowledgement entails. (Trubek 1990, 54)

Office activism

Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, the CLS movement compiled a subversive oeuvre, but CLS scholarship was also profoundly practice-oriented. The Crits took out their bullhorns and sought to awaken staid ivory tower inhabitants and compel them to link their professional work to political praxis. It was imperative to the Crits then – and it should be imperative to critical political scientists now – that academics understand themselves as powerful political actors in their workplaces. With the proper organization and militant strategies, we are capable of achieving greater workplace self-determination. We are capable of remarkably improving our own professional lives, the lives of other employees, and the lives of students. We also are capable of radically transforming entire departments and universities. Crits such as Duncan Kennedy saw CLS as a force that could raise colleagues' political consciousness and begin the process of sweeping office activism (Kennedy 1986).

For decades, American conservatives have attacked colleges and universities as bastions of progressive values, which disseminate poisonous instruction to young minds. The common liberal response to conservatives' attacks is to declare that the academy is not progressive and that it should not be progressive. Instead, colleges and universities function well because they are aggressively agnostic and actively cultivate an expansive – and unadjudicated – ideological pluralism. *Let a hundred flowers bloom.* Fortunately, the Crits understood that colleges and universities are inherently political places and that the dominant modes of knowledge production and distribution connected to the academy – publication, conference participation, class-

room instruction, university service, and public intellectual engagement, to name just a few – are unavoidably ideological. Critical political scientists, like the Crits, should seize this opportunity and openly engage in workplace praxis.

Many Crits used their professional positions to struggle for humane reforms within their discipline, to press for new ideological and institutional commitments within their universities, and to agitate for a different kind of future for academics, for students, for the university, and for American politics. This commitment certainly applies to today's university landscape. Part and parcel of being a critical academic is creating space for future critical academics to organize, operate, and grow political strength. Office activism is political activism, and critical political scientists are both well-positioned and also capable of spearheading office activism within their departments and universities.

Classroom and community

Throughout the history of the CLS movement, Crits imagined and modeled new relationships within the legal academy and across the broader legal system. Crit professors explored the political possibilities that existed within teaching, and they worked hard to inspire a different kind of law student through their critical pedagogical approaches. For example, Karl Klare, Robert Gordon, and Jay Feinman have outlined how critical legal pedagogy introduced law students to the kind of professional power, normative duty, and creative ability that legal practice affords (Gordon 1989; Klare 2011; Feinman 2020). Gordon has described how Crit classrooms emphasized the ideological choices and institutional alternatives available to leftist lawyers:

You need not try to “rationalize” the legal system to your students nor do you have to try to defend most of its decisions nor explain most of it as making sense. You can help the students acquire the skills they need to understand how the system works, and to function inside it as counsellors and advocates, without assuming the heroic, Herculean one might say, task of constructing it as a coherent system or as one having what Ronald Dworkin would call “integrity”.

For perhaps the most central CLS tenet is that the legal system is not a single, integral system at all. Rather it is a teeming jungle of multiple, overlapping, contradictory systems, each pregnant at every historical moment with multiple alternative interpretations, possibilities and trajectories of future development. (Gordon 1989, 76–7)

Additionally, the Crits' teaching and professional service extended beyond the classroom. One of the most beneficial, yet overlooked, aspects of the CLS movement was the egalitarian community fostered amongst Crits. Crits believed that American law schools were hierarchical environments that overlooked many people and generated extreme inequalities. Crits fought for campus programs that would protect underrepresented groups and weaken the illegitimate privileges of those residing at the top of the law school hierarchy.

Building a supportive community also meant that Crits endeavored to mentor law students and younger scholars, who they invited to conferences, meetings, book clubs, and helped to advance professionally. According to Mari Matsuda, “There was, simply, no place else to go if you took both material and ideological analysis seriously, identified as left progressive, and worked at a law school. CLS was it” (Matsuda 2020, 2). As many Crits have noted over the years, the movement supplied tremendous emotional, spiritual, and social support for those who were new to the academy or who were, in some way, alone in the academy. Sustaining solidarity between diverse leftists across the country was not an easy task during the Cold War, but CLS carried out this monumental feat for years. “CLS informed why I was doing what I was doing, where my work fit in the context of the issues I cared about and the social movements of which I was then a part,” one Crit recollected (Gertner 2020, 1). Another Crit, Katherine Stone, has recalled how her “long-standing involvement with CLS has given me a community in which to try out ideas and learn from others” (Stone 2020, 4).

More than CLS redux

It is heartening to look back and remember how the CLS movement grew and excelled

in the legal academy, even as hundreds of law school administrators and faculty members publicly bashed the movement. CLS – at its best – brought revolutionary bravado and open activism to American law schools, and there are lessons to be learned from the subversive scholarship, office activism, and supportive community established by the Crits.

But any meaningful CLS intervention in political science must be sure to historicize the experiences and virtues of the Crits, while also highlighting the movement identity of CLS. Much has changed in American society since the heyday of the CLS movement, and the roadblocks facing the heterogeneous leftwing working within political science today are not identical to the roadblocks facing Crits working within law schools during the Cold War. However, the Crits' ability to collectively organize and to maintain a politically active movement for more than a decade should encourage present-day critical political scientists. A similar impetus for solidarity, movement mobilization, and revolutionary change would be welcome within the discipline.

PAUL J. BAUMGARDNER

References

- Austin, Arthur. 1998. *The Empire Strikes Back: Outsiders and the Struggle over Legal Education*. New York: New York University Press.
- Baumgardner, Paul. 2019. "Ronald Reagan, The Modern Right, and ... the Rise of the Fem Crits." *Laws* 8, no. 4: 1–26.
- Baumgardner, Paul. 2021. *Critical Legal Studies and the Campaign for American Law Schools: A Revolution to Break the Liberal Consensus*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cameron, Charles M. and Kornhauser, Lewis A. 2005. "Decision Rules in a Judicial Hierarchy," *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics* 161, no. 2: 264–92.
- Feinman, Jay. 2020. "Critical Teaching," in *Critical Legal Studies: Intellectual History and the History of the Present*, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ. (February 27–28). <https://clsconference.princeton.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/691/2020/02/Feinman-Critical-Teaching.pdf>.
- Freeman, Alan David and Schlegel, John Henry. 1985. "Sex, Power, and Silliness: An Essay on Ackerman's *Reconstructing American Law*." *Cardozo Law Review* 6: 847–64.
- Gertner, Nancy. 2020. "Critical Practice, Judging and Teaching," in *Critical Legal Studies: Intellectual History and the History of the Present*, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ. (February 27–28). <https://clsconference.princeton.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/691/2020/02/Gertner-Critical-Practice-Judging-and-Teaching.pdf>.
- Gordon, Robert W. 1989. "Critical Legal Studies as a Teaching Method, Against the Background of the Intellectual Politics of Modern Legal Education in the United States," *Legal Education Review* no. 1: 59–84.
- Gordon, Robert W. 1996. "American Law Through English Eyes: A Century of Nightmares and Noble Dreams." *Georgetown Law Journal* Vol. 84: 2215–43.
- Hutchinson, Allan C. 1987. "Indiana Dworkin and Law's Empire." *Yale Law Journal* 96, no. 3: 637–65.
- Hutchinson, Allan C, ed. 1989. *Critical Legal Studies*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Kelman, Mark G. 1984. "Trashing." *Stanford Law Review* 36, no. 1: 293–348.
- Kennedy, Duncan. 1982. "Legal Education and the Reproduction of Hierarchy." *Journal of Legal Education* 32, no. 4: 591–615.
- Kennedy, Duncan. 1985. "Psycho-Social CLS: A Comment on the Cardozo Symposium." *Cardozo Law Review* 6: 1013–31.
- Kennedy, Duncan. 1986. "Liberal Values in Legal Education." *Nova Law Journal* 10: 603–17.
- Klare, Karl. 2011. "Teaching *Local 1330* – Reflections on Critical Legal Pedagogy." *Unbound: Harvard Journal of the Legal Left* 7: 58–78.
- Matsuda, Mari. 2020. "Talking about Critical Legal Studies While We Are on the Short Clock of the World." *Critical Legal Studies: Intellectual History and the History of the Present*, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ. (February 27–28). <https://clsconference.princeton.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/691/2020/02/Matsuda-Talking-about-Critical-Legal-Studies-While-We-Are-On-the-Short-Clock-of-the-World.pdf>.
- Rosenberg, Gerald N. 2000. "Across the Great Divide (between Law and Political Science)." *Green Bag* 3, no. 3: 267–72.
- Stone, Katherine. 2020. "Reflections on My CLS Practice – Scholarship and Pedagogy," *Critical Legal Studies: Intellectual History and the History of the Present*, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ. (February 27–28) <https://clsconference.princeton.edu/wpcontent/uploads/sites/691/2020/02/Stone-Reflections-on-my-CLS-practice.pdf>.
- Teles, Steven M. 2008. *The Rise of the Conservative Legal Movement: The Battle for Control of the Law*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Trubek, David M. 1990. "Back to the Future:

- The Short, Happy Life of the Law and Society Movement.” *Florida State University Law Review* 8, no. 1: 1–55.
- Tushnet, Mark V. 1980. “Dia-Tribe.” *Michigan Law Review* 78, no. 5: 694–710.
- Unger, Roberto Mangabeira. 2015. *The Critical Legal Studies Movement: Another Time, A Greater Task*. New York: Verso.
- Whittington, Keith E., “Once More Unto the Breach: Post Behavioralist Approaches to Judicial Politics.” *Law & Social Inquiry* 25, no. 2: 601–34.

31. Feminist critiques of political science

Since its inception as a discipline in the late nineteenth century, mainstream political science has claimed to advance an objective account of political life. An objective account implies “a grasp of the actual qualities and relations of objects as they exist independent of the inquirer’s thoughts and desires regarding them” (Cunningham 1973, 4). Rather than providing accounts free from distortion, bias, and error, feminist scholars argue that observations, theories, methods of inquiry, and analytical techniques accredited by the political science discipline are thoroughly androcentric (grounded in the experiences of a small cohort of elite men), racially biased (privileging the worldview of Whites), and impervious to the complex ways these biases structure and sustain relations of power.

As Marianne Githens (1983, 475) noted decades ago:

the orientation of political science as a field, the concepts used, and the questions asked treat gender research as an addendum to the discipline or worse, women’s political behavior is subsumed under a framework of deviance ... fail[ing] to see that study of half the human population might change understandings of power, politics and political life.

More recently, critical race and postcolonial feminist scholars have pointed out that the division of the human population into a male/female binary is itself a problematic artifact of modernity that masks intricate processes of racialization and geopolitics linked to the marginalization of the majority of the world population. When people of color are classified as “minorities,” it creates the false impression that white residents of Europe and North America constitute far more than 16 percent of the global populace. Indeed, when the “Euro-American reference group” is taken as the constitutive norm of political behavior, it skews perception in terms of geographic misrepresentation (Europe is depicted as larger than Africa on maps) and historical misrepresentation (Europe is elevated into a self-creating entity unto itself) (Mills 2008, 237–8).

Grappling with a discipline that claims analytic neutrality, feminist scholars have

sought to demonstrate the nature, scope, and consequences of the systematic omissions and distortions embedded within the practice of political science, to reveal how this social science constitutes its research object in the process of knowing it, and to hold political scientists accountable for the hierarchies and inequalities they perpetuate and legitimate. Toward that end, feminist scholars engage canonical texts, disciplinary discourses, substantive research findings, and diverse methodologies to advance a systematic critique of political science. They have invented concepts, language, and modes of analysis to enable new ways of seeing and new ways of thinking. Feminist critiques of the discipline include analysis of bias in interpretive paradigms and canonical texts, claims about political life that mask gender and racial power, and implications of persistent sexist and racist bias in Western political science.

The political world envisioned and enabled by American political science

The early works of American political science actively constructed a conception of the nation-state as white men’s domain and advocated a “civilizing” mission that justified both domination and empire building as beneficial for the “backward” races and paternal rule as necessary for the “inferior” sex. They conceived the nation state as an achievement of Anglo-Saxon civilization, which emerged through a unique process of development under the leadership of white men, who understood their duty to rule the “lower” races. From its earliest conceptualization as an object of study, the nation-state was a raced and gendered concept. It afforded the opportunity for self-governance exclusively to white men and actively excluded women and people of color. Indeed, within the framework established by political science, exclusions from citizenship were said to be required for the sake of democracy itself. By vindicating a specific racial and gender order as essential to individual freedom and rational governance, the founders of political science performed “a double mystification” (Mills 2015, 10). They masked the brutal practices of white settler societies ranging from slaughter of indigenous populations and centuries of exploitation of slave labor

to *de jure* exclusions from schooling and rights of citizenship of large segments of the population born on “American” soil. They invented a past in which founding violence was cast as an independence struggle against the British Crown, while violence against the indigenous and enslaved populations was masked by claims about the requirements of ruling inherently “backward races.” Reliance on “race” to explain the civilizational genius of the “Teutonic Branch” and the child-like primitivism of the “less civilized” provided a justification for coercive control of “inferiors” within national borders and imperial expansion overseas (Lake and Reynolds 2008).

Moving from scholarly treatises to the halls of government, early political scientists became policymakers who shaped laws, policies, and analytic practices both within and across nations. Through their racializing interpretations of the past, they helped institutionalize notions of racial and gender order that continue to haunt contemporary thinking with profound consequences for the world and the people who inhabit it.

The political production of raced-gendered hierarchies

Central to field formation, early political scientists constructed a “classic canon,” a set of texts drawn from Western philosophy to shape the thinking of “educated men.” Although these “great books” differed in their conceptions of the good life, the possibilities for structuring governance, the nature of law, morality, warfare, and freedom, among other things, they concurred in according natural superiority to free European men. Feminist scholars have traced profound and systematic sexism and misogyny in the classic cannon, tracing noxious representations of women in canonical texts, representations that violate universal maxims about respect for persons. Both ancient and modern philosophers have advanced universal claims about human nature and then contradicted them by reifying gender difference in ways that suggest that women are not fully human (Hawkesworth 1990, 17–46). From constructions of women as dangerous, frivolous, corrupt, and incapable of justice to claims about women’s cunning, ruthlessness, and egoism, political theorists have insisted that women need to be controlled, or indeed, “domesticated,” not

only for the well-being of society but for their own good.

Many contemporary political theorists have distanced themselves from the blatant sexism that riddles canonical texts, but they have not abandoned the conviction that sex is morally and epistemically irrelevant to political theory or revised the classic canon to include philosophical works by feminists. Advancing interlocking notions about the universality of reason, the operations of the mind, and the fungibility of knowers, mainstream thinkers reject concerns about physical, temporal, and geopolitical specificity in knowledge production, or treat these phenomena as problems to be eliminated through sophisticated methodology.

One strand of feminist epistemology has attempted to specify when and under what conditions the “sex of the knower is epistemically significant” (Code 1981, 1991). Rejecting the view that all knowers think identically, Linda Alcoff (2007, 42) has argued that the situatedness of a particular knower can be relevant to judgment about “issues of coherence, consistency, relevance, plausibility, and credibility.” Specific experiences, social locations, perceptual practices and habits, styles of reasoning, and sets of interests may affect empirical and normative claims; hence all knowers are not epistemically identical or equal. Indeed, feminists’ “critical orientation may be different and richer in regard to certain kinds of gender-related issues, richer in the sense of being based on more direct and comprehensive knowledge and experience” (Alcoff 2007, 46).

Attuned to the diversity and complexity of women’s lives, feminist scholars have illuminated the injustice of male domination and women’s subordination. In an effort to “denaturalize” social relations and social roles of women and men, liberal feminist theorists argued that women’s “nature” is an altogether artificial thing, the result of forced repression of certain capacities and excessive stimulation of other capabilities (Wollstonecraft 1792; Taylor 1851; Mill 1869). They emphasized the role of law in excluding women from educational and occupational opportunities, from legal standing and constitutional rights, and from participation in politics and public life, thereby producing women as inferior beings (Landes 1988). As early as the 1830s, black feminist theorists

in the United States pointed out that state and federal laws deprived black women and men of the status of human beings, denying them rights of self-determination and constitutional protections in ways that differed significantly from the deprivations experienced by white American women (Maria Stewart in Richardson 1987; Guy-Sheftall 1995). Contrary to dominant beliefs, feminists argued that the subordination of women and the systematic dehumanization of blacks were the effects of sexist and racist theories of human nature embedded in legal codes. They were socially produced and sustained hierarchies, not a reflection of natural aptitudes and abilities, and as such, they could be changed.

Socialist feminist theorists expanded the analysis of women's oppression by examining exploitative divisions of labor within capitalist industrial production, unequal roles in physical and social reproduction sanctioned by marriage practices and kinship systems, as well as historically specific modes of circulation, trade, and exchange. Feminist historical materialism launched empirical investigations of unique modes of sexist domination at work and at home to illuminate critical class, ethnic, racial, and geopolitical differences among women.

These investigations challenged the liberal demarcation between public and private as a patriarchal tactic that masks power (Pateman 1988, 13). In marked contrast to their claim to have repudiated ascription standards that fix a person's life prospects from birth, social contract theorists justified modern civil subjection by coupling a story of freedom for property-owning men with a story of women's "natural" subjection. The social contract – the means by which "rational beings" order their social relations and structure their system of limited governance – establishes men's political right over women and men's orderly access to women's bodies. The "original contract establishes the law of male sex right" (Pateman 1988, 2). Insisting that "women's natures are such that they are properly subject to men and their proper place is in the private, domestic sphere, and that men properly inhabit and rule within both spheres," liberal theorists obscure and mystify the social reality they help create (Pateman 1987, 105).

Liberal bourgeois domesticity was inherently political, then, even as the private sphere

was proclaimed pre-political and "protected" from the intrusions of state power. By situating women in a domain supposedly beyond the reach of the state and barring them from public speech and political participation, the public sphere naturalized women's subordination, allowing the rhetoric of motherhood and separate spheres to mask the explicit acts of men that produced women's subordination.

Marriage illustrates inherent contradictions in the liberal construction of public and private. A matter of public record, licensed by the state, marriage is nonetheless perceived as the most private of relations – a site of intimacy organized through voluntary agreement and insulated from unwarranted intrusions by the state. Yet even in the most egalitarian households, conjugal relations and sexual divisions of labor are profoundly unequal, and these pervasive inequalities affect women's prospects in employment and public life (Okin 1989, 134–69). Marriage irrevocably weds "juridical equality to social inequality ... to form a coherent social structure" (Pateman 1988, 229). Marriage law recognizes the legitimacy of male control in the private sphere – in the family, the home, and in conjugal relations. Under the common law doctrine of coverture, a woman experienced "civil death" upon entering marriage. She ceased to exist in the eyes of the state. "A wife was required to live where her husband demanded ... her earnings belonged to her husband and her children were the property of her husband, just as children of the female slave belonged to her master" (Pateman 1988, 121). A wife who worked full time in the conjugal home was not entitled to pay; she was entitled only to subsistence in return for her labors. Until 1884 in Britain, "a wife could be jailed for refusing conjugal rights, and until 1891, husbands were allowed forcibly to imprison their wives in the matrimonial home to obtain their rights" (Pateman 1988, 123). Rape within marriage was politicized only in the 1970s through feminist activism around the globe, but it is not yet prohibited in all nations.

Operating according to heteronormative and procreationist assumptions, the marriage contract governs the performance of sexual services, reproductive labor, child care, and house work as well as love, affection, and companionship. In the twenty-first century, only 29 of 200 nations in the world permit same-sex marriage. Those denied the right to

marry are stigmatized as second-class citizens and precluded from a host of state-regulated benefits, including rights to inherit property, adopt and retain custody of children, receive tax benefits and health insurance coverage, and make critical legal and medical decisions on behalf of an impaired partner.

Canonical approaches to political science suggest that race and sex are simply biological or physical characteristics. This “primordial view” suggests that race and sex precede politics. As part of the natural or given aspects of human existence, race and sex – much like individual aptitude – are understood to be apolitical. Feminist studies of theories, laws, norms, and organizational practices that enforce racial segregation and separate spheres for men and women call the primordial view of race and sex into question. The state has used laws and policy as mechanisms of *racialization and gendering* – constructing relations of power and forms of inequality that shape the identities and aptitudes of individuals. Far from being natural givens, racial and gendered hierarchies of difference have been produced and maintained through thoroughly political processes. The imputed natural interests and abilities of women and men of various races are the result of state-prescribed limitations in education, occupation, immigration, citizenship, and office holding. Politics *produces* race and gender not only by creating and maintaining raced, gendered and sexual divisions within the population, but by defining race and gender characteristics and according differential rights on the basis of those definitions.

Political behavior and political institutions

Feminist scholars have investigated gender dynamics in voting behavior, electoral politics, and the operations of particular institutions, such as political parties, legislatures, bureaucratic agencies, and the courts. They have examined the effects of gender on policymaking and implementation and on political recruitment and leadership. Careful to avoid universalizing and essentialist claims, they have sought to discover whether there are differences between male and female legislators in leadership style or substance in particular political systems. Their findings suggest that neither political priorities nor the standard operating procedures of political

institutions are gender inclusive or gender neutral (Waylen, Celis, Kantola, and Weldon 2013).

Studies of national parliaments and legislatures have revealed the operation of powerful gender norms. The standard operating procedures of parliaments in Britain, Canada, and Australia, for example, feature loud, aggressive, and combative behavior, such as screaming, shouting, and sneering that can create “no-win” situations for women members. Women who adopt this combative style are ridiculed and patronized by their male counterparts, while women who opt for a more demure, consultative, and collaborative style are labeled “weak” or “unfit” for the job. Indeed, Chappell (2002) has documented patterns of gender harassment in parliamentary systems as women who rise to speak are greeted with increased heckling, coughing, hissing, kiss blowing, and mimicry in falsetto voices. Within the U.S., women legislators who refuse to adopt coercive negotiating strategies are often characterized by their male counterparts as failing to understand the rules of the game (Rosenthal 2000). Women chairing legislative committees confront forms of opposition in hearings – challenges to their authority, refusal to respect their rulings – that men in comparable positions of authority do not confront (Kathlene 1994). Male legislators often perceive women legislators in terms of raced and gendered stereotypes incompatible with the men’s conceptions of “power players” (Smooth 2001; Thomas 1994).

Studies of political parties in South Asia, Australia, Canada, Europe, Latin America, and the United States have demonstrated that male-dominant party elites have been remarkably resourceful in shifting the locus of power from formal to informal mechanisms when women have gained access to formal decision-making sites. Parties that differ from one another in ideological commitments and policy objectives have been remarkably similar and consistent in allowing male gatekeepers to structure candidate selection processes to prevent women from being chosen for open, safe, or winnable seats in legislative races. Patronage practices within political parties also manifest pervasive gender bias.

Androcentric bias arbitrarily restricts the research agenda of political scientists, preventing certain political questions from

being perceived and empirically investigated. For example, although according to the Interparliamentary Union, 75 percent of the seats in national legislatures and more than 90 percent of the offices of president, prime minister, and foreign secretary are currently in the hands of men, the absence of women from national and international decision-making is a "nonquestion" in mainstream political science. For it is assumed that the answer is already known: fewer women hold office because fewer women seek office and this decision is simply a matter of individual choice. Feminist scholars have proven that "individual choice" explanations for women's underrepresentation in elective and appointive offices are woefully inadequate and only serve to mask the potent operations of gender power and gendered structures. Mainstream accounts are oblivious to forces that shape individual "preferences" or "determine" the will, to institutional contexts that enable and constrain individual action, to structural forces that ensure that individuals are not equally unfettered subjects. They mask recurrent patterns of constraint upon individual choice linked to race, gender, class, nationality, and sexuality.

In documenting the operation of gender power within the official institutions of state, feminist scholars have provided powerful evidence that there are political dynamics at work within these institutions that have not been recognized by mainstream approaches. They have also demonstrated that the raced and gendered hierarchies created, maintained, and reproduced within the institutions of state have palpable effects on policymaking and on domestic and foreign policies. To advance an account of political life that omits these raced and gendered dynamics, then, does not reflect or foster objective or value-neutral inquiry. When political scientists ignore the operations of gender power documented by feminist scholars, their omissions accredit and perpetuate distorted accounts of the political world.

Feminist international relations research

Pointing out the inadequacies of flawed understandings of value-neutrality in research, feminist scholarship draws attention to the politics of knowledge. In the field of International Relations (IR), feminist schol-

ars moved beyond the study of women to analyse changing gender dynamics in transnational, international, and global institutions, processes, and orders. They offer fresh insights into wide-ranging phenomena, such as nationalism, globalization, militarization, international conventions and organizations, financial flows, structural adjustment policies, economic restructuring, labor migration, neoliberalism, fundamentalism, postsocialism, and hegemony (Peterson and Runyon 1999).

Rejecting the insistence that race and sex are attributes of individuals, and as such, play no role at the international level, feminists adopt intersectionality as an analytical framework to investigate the mutually constitutive and structuring power of race, gender, class, ethnicity, sexuality, and nationality. They have demonstrated how hierarchies of difference are created, sustained, challenged, and reproduced through the daily operations of state power as nations interact to realize their visions of national, regional, and international order. Raced-gendered patterns of skilling and deskilling, differences in political rights and economic opportunities, and specific modes of political visibility and invisibility structure local, national, and international regimes (Peterson 2003).

Policies and conventions operating at the international level structure human relationships as well as the relations among states. Population policies, development policies, disarmament protocols, the law of the sea, peace-keeping missions, refugee policies, anti-poverty initiatives, millennium development goals, human rights protocols, and trade agreements constrain individual action as well as state conduct. Operating through national legislation, moral prohibitions, informal mechanisms of social control, appeals to the conscience of the world community, sexual and racial divisions of labor, and armed peace-keepers, international conventions support and maintain regulatory sexual and racial regimes that undermine the autonomy of certain subjects while shoring up the power of others. Practices of inequality become embedded in institutions and structures in ways that enable systems of racial, ethnic, gender, and sexual advantage and disadvantage to operate independently of the will of particular agents. Forms of privilege are converted into rules, routines, practices, policies, institutions, and structures that serve

and promote certain interests, creating political opportunity structures that are neither race nor gender neutral (Bergeron 2006; Kabeer 1994; Rai 2002).

Racial and gender orders are embodied in chains of command as well as in policy papers and effects. Whether within the leadership or professional staff of international institutions, state ministries, secretariats, advisory councils, or global civil society organizations, women remain markedly underrepresented with palpable consequences for the design and implementation of programs and the monitoring of results. Male-dominated institutions at the national and international level, for example, have operated to derail policies designed to promote gender equality, such as gender mainstreaming, a transnational feminist effort to enhance women's participation in national and international organizations (Verloo 2005).

Feminist scholars have documented systemic racial and gender orders entrenched within the productive, reproductive, virtual, and care economies associated with globalization (Peterson 2003). They have demonstrated the seismic proportions of the global reproductive and care economies, conducting path-breaking studies of global phenomena such as sex tourism, sex trafficking, marriage migration, the transnational surrogacy industry, and the global outsourcing of reproductive labor – all neglected in mainstream international relation scholarship.

Feminist scholars have made visible the counter-hegemonic order of transnational feminism, a subject largely neglected by mainstream journals in political science. They have explored networks, alliances, and coalitions that have emerged during the past century of transnational feminist activism, theorizing “transversal” politics, the arduous work involved in bridging differences and challenging growing inequalities as women's rights activists mobilize to transform the prevailing global order and demand accountability from governments and international agencies. Operating through sub-regional, regional, and global conferences, as well as websites, listservs, cyberjournals, newsletters, and public reports, transnational feminists have forged a transnational agenda to break down structural inequality between the North and South, redress the depredations of colonial and neo-colonial domination, fight institutional, cultural, and individual racisms,

alleviate poverty through debt forgiveness, land and income redistribution, educational opportunity, and accessible and affordable health care, foster national self-reliance, regulate multi-national corporations, and reduce military operations and expenditures (Hawkesworth 2006).

In contrast to development discourses that conceive women as objects of regulation and control, victims in need of saving, micro-entrepreneurs who embody the solution to poverty, or child-bearers capable of redressing the looming population crises of welfare and postsocialist states, feminist scholars explore models of development “from below,” manifested in women's work with international organizations, transnational NGOs, national, regional, and local governments, and progressive solidarity networks to achieve an equitable and sustainable allocation of resources to meet basic needs. They emphasize that equitable development is inseparable from the empowerment of local women to determine their own priorities and devise means to address them. Whether those priorities involve poverty, racism, unequal trade relations, structural adjustment policies, coercive population control mechanisms, militarism, war, environmental degradation, or the politics of water, feminist analyses tie equitable and sustainable development to expanded conceptions of democratic practice and redistributive justice (Kabeer 1994; Rai 2002).

Feminist scholars have also documented the complex consequences of failure to adopt policies that take redistributive justice seriously, documenting how the growing inequalities associated with neoliberalism destabilize national and international orders. In a detailed examination of once-oil-rich Kuwait, for example, Mary Ann Tetreault (1999) demonstrated that economic restructuring stands in complex relation to gender oppression. Constructing women's employment and women's rights as scapegoats, leaders of nationalist and militant religious movements stoked the anger and resentment of men whose economic circumstances were worsening, contributing to escalating public and private violence. Increasing incidences of domestic violence, anomic violence, and orchestrated civil unrest have all been intimately interrelated in circumstances of economic dislocation (IFJP 2006).

If the economic restructuring of neoliberal globalization poses significant threats to women's full and equal citizenship, so too does nationalism, a political force often characterized as globalization's "other." There are clear tensions between the putatively inclusive language of nationalism and the raced-gendered hierarchies that structure membership in the nation. Within many contemporary nations – republican, parliamentary, and authoritarian – political and legal equality coexist with distinctly gendered modes of citizenship that authorize regulation of women's bodies for the "common good." Pronatalist and anti-abortion legislation in nations as diverse as Japan, Poland, Russia, Sweden, Turkey, and the USA politicize reproductive behavior, inserting the rights of the nation into the womb of women citizens by according the state a legitimate interest in mandating reproduction for some (white, affluent, heterosexual) citizens, while curbing the reproduction of other citizens (low-income, people of color, gays and lesbians). In contrast to neoliberalism's relentless pressure toward privatization, women's reproductive organs are "publicized" – claimed as legitimate targets of public regulation and concern – as nations act "to protect life and health" and to increase the national population.

Conclusion

Feminist political science has challenged the accuracy of the discipline's claim to provide neutral, objective knowledge about the political world. Through detailed investigations of more inclusive samples of the world's population, feminist scholars have identified and sought to correct omissions and distortions that permeate political science. Through the use of gender and intersectionality as analytical tools, they have illuminated social and political relations neglected by mainstream accounts, advanced alternative explanations of political phenomena, demonstrated the defects of competing hypotheses, and debunked opposing views. Despite such impressive accomplishments, feminist political science has not become a dominant paradigm within the discipline. Few doctoral programs allow students to develop areas of concentration in feminist approaches to political studies. Few routinely include feminist scholarship in proseminars in American

politics, comparative politics, international relations, political theory, public law, or public policy. None requires familiarity with leading feminist scholarship as a criterion of professional competence. Indeed, the American Political Science Association Task Force *Report on Political Science in the 21st Century* (2011, 1) documents persistent bias against the study of race, gender, and inequality within political science compared to most other social science disciplines: "Flagship journals have, on the whole, rarely addressed issues of race, ethnicity, and gender ... [and] text books treat race, ethnicity, and gender ... as marginal aspects of the political system, rather than as woven into the fabric of American politics." As a consequence of such sustained neglect, the Task Force *Report* concludes that the discipline is "ill-equipped to address in a sustained way why many of the most marginal members of political communities around the world are often unable to have their needs effectively addressed by governments ... [and] ill-equipped to develop explanations for the social, political and economic processes that lead to groups' marginalization" (1). Feminist scholars might add that such sustained failure to address systematic bias impugns the discipline's characterization as "scientific." By refusing to engage refutations of received views and insulating their own hypotheses from counterevidence, political scientists violate the criteria of scientific inquiry that they themselves espouse. Instead, they reproduce a world of racial and gender domination under the guise of neutral observation, detached inquiry, and objective analysis.

MARY E. HAWKESWORTH

References

- Alcoff, Linda. 2000. "On Judging Epistemic Credibility: Is Social Identity Relevant?" In *Race and Epistemologies of Ignorance*, edited by Shannon Sullivan and Nancy Tuana, 53–80. Albany: SUNY Press.
- American Political Science Association. 2011. *Report of the Task Force on Political Science in the 21st Century*. Washington, D.C.: American Political Science Association. Available at: www.apsanet.org/files/Task%20Force%20Reports/TF_21st%20Century_AllPgs_webres90.pdf.
- Bergeron, Suzanne. 2006. *Fragments of Development: Nation, Gender, and the Space of Modernity*. New York: Routledge.
- Chappell, Louise. 2002. *Gendering Government*.

MARY E. HAWKESWORTH

- Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Code, Lorraine. 1981. "Is the Sex of the Knower Epistemologically Significant?" *Metaphilosophy* 12: 267–76.
- Code, Lorraine. 1991. *What Can She Know?* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Cunningham, Frank. 1973. *Objectivity in Social Science*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Githens, Marianne. 1983. "The Elusive Paradigm: Gender, Politics, and Political Behavior." In *Political Science: The State of the Art*, edited by Ada Finifter, Washington, DC: American Political Science Association.
- Guy-Sheftall, Beverly. 1995. *Words of Fire*. New York: The New Press.
- Hawkesworth, Mary. 1990. "The Reification of Difference." *Beyond Oppression*. New York: Continuum.
- Hawkesworth, Mary. 2006. *Globalization and Feminist Activism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- IFJP. 2006. "Special Issue: Gender Violence and Hegemonic Projects." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 8(4): 467–659.
- Kabeer, Naila. 2003. *Reversed Realities: Gender Hierarchies in Development Thought*. London: Verso.
- Kathlene, Lyn. 1994. "Power and Influence in State Legislative Policymaking: The Interaction of Gender and Position in Committee Hearing Debates." *American Political Science Review* 88 (September): 560–76.
- Lake, Marilyn and Henry Reynolds. 2008. *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Landes, Joan. 1988. *Women and the Public Sphere in the Age of the French Revolution*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Landes, Joan. 1998. *Feminism, the Public and the Private*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mill, John Stuart. 1971 [1869]. *The Subjection of Women*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.
- Mills, Charles. 2008. "White Ignorance." In *Agnology: The Making and Unmaking of Ignorance*, edited by Robert Proctor and Londa Schiebinger, 230–49. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Mills, Charles W. 2015. "Decolonizing Western Political Philosophy." *New Political Science* 37, no. 1: 1–24.
- Offen, Karen. 2000. *European Feminisms, 1700–1950*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Okin, Susan Moller. 1989. *Justice, Gender and the Family*. New York: Basic Books.
- Pateman, Carole. 1988. *The Sexual Contract*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Peterson, V. Spike. 1992. *Gendered States: Feminist (Re)Visions of International Relations Theory*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Peterson, V. Spike. 2003. *A Critical Rewriting of Global Political Economy: Integrating Reproductive, Productive, and Virtual Economies*. New York: Routledge.
- Peterson, V. Spike, and Anne Sisson Runyan. 1999. *Global Gender Issues*, 2nd edn. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Rai, Shirin. 2002. *Gender and the Political Economy of Development*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Richardson, Marilyn. 1987. *Maria Stewart, America's First Black Woman Political Writer*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Rosenthal, Cindy Simon. 2000. "Gender Styles in State Legislative Committees: Raising Their Voices and Resolving Conflict." *Women and Politics* 21, no. 2: 21–45.
- Smooth, Wendy. 2001. *African American Women State Legislators: The Impact of Gender and Race on Legislative Influence*. PhD Dissertation. University of Maryland.
- Taylor, Harriet. 1851. "The Enfranchisement of Women." *Westminster and Foreign Quarterly Review* (July): 93–121. Available at harriettaylor1851.pdf (free.fr).
- Tetreault, Mary Ann. 1999. "Sex and Violence: Social Reactions to Economic Restructuring in Kuwait." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 1, no. 2: 237–55.
- Thomas, Sue. 1994. *How Women Legislate*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tickner, J. Ann. 2001. *Gendering World Politics: Issues and Approaches in the Post-Cold War Era*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Verloo, Mieke. 2005. "Displacement and Empowerment: Reflections on the Concept and Practice of the Council of Europe Approach to Gender Mainstreaming and Gender Equality." *Social Politics* 12, no. 3: 344–65.
- Waylen, Georgina, Karen Celis, Johanna Kantola, and S. Laurel Weldon. 2013. *The Oxford Handbook of Gender and Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wollstonecraft, Mary. 175. [1792]. *Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, edited by Carol H. Poston. New York: W. W. Norton.

See also

Intersectionality; Feminist Theory and the State;
Nancy C. M. Hartsock

32. Critical race theory

Critical race theory (CRT) is both a social movement and a theoretical framework used by those seeking to study and transform the relationship between race, racism, and power (Delgado and Stefancic 2017). It also offers a lens through which to analyse and fight racial inequality (Rollock and Gillborn 2011). For critical race theorists, the law is not and has never been neutral. Rather, people of color live in a hostile world made much more so by racism “institutionalized in and by the law” (Bell 1995, 898). While no single position statement defines CRT, its adherents tend to share “a social constructivist perspective of race and racism” and a commitment to opposing various systems that “subjugate people of color” (Rollock and Gillborn 2011, 2).

CRT emerged during the 1970s in response to the stalled progress of civil rights litigation to produce significant advances for the masses of people of color (Taylor 1998; Delgado and Stefancic 2017). This was an important tactical shift given the inadequacies of incremental models of change, the blowback against the freedom movement, and the rise of a more conservative judiciary positioned to roll back the gains of the struggle (Brown and Jackson 2013). At the same time, CRT challenged liberalism for its traditional notions of steady racial progress and its preferred approaches to legal remedies for discrimination. Similarly, CRT confronted critical legal studies for its failure to include racism in its critique of American society (Ladson-Billings 1998).

In the early goings, a small group of progressive activists and legal scholars labored to “deconstruct traditional liberal approaches to legal ideology and discourse with a view to better conceptualizing how structural (class) inequalities were perpetuated and maintained in US society” (Rollock and Gillborn 2011, 1). In the years since its emergence, CRT has given rise to variants that center other marginalized groups, including Native peoples, Latinx folk, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, LGBTQ+ peoples, Muslims, and Arabs. It also has a presence in other academic disciplines such as American studies, anthropology, education, English, ethnic studies, philosophy, political science, sociology, and women’s and gender studies.

Furthermore, CRT is now global, having extended to Australia, Brazil, India, New Zealand, South Africa, the United Kingdom, and more (Delgado and Stefancic 2017). Across these peoples and spaces, CRT practitioners have sought to build a more egalitarian, all-inclusive society (Bell 1995).

Major concepts and unifying ideas of CRT scholarship

As a disruptive endeavor committed to scholarly resistance, CRT is as intellectually and methodologically diverse as the people that comprise the movement. Its pioneers and influencers include, among others, Derrick Bell (1976, 1979, 1992), Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw (1987, 1989), Richard Delgado (1984), Alan Freeman (1978), Lani Guinier (1993), Cheryl Harris (1993), Charles Lawrence (1987), Ian Haney López (1997), Mari Matsuda (1987), and Patricia Williams (1990). Yet, despite their differences, CRT scholars generally believe: (1) race is a social construct that shapes politics and policy; (2) racism is an ordinary, not aberrational, feature of everyday life; (3) whites occupy a superordinate position in the American racial order that benefits them in numerous ways as the dominant group; (4) the dominant racial group differentiates and stereotypes subordinate groups in ways that serve the prevailing order; and (5) civil rights laws mostly serve white interests and only aid people of color when their interests converge with those of whites (Bell 1980; Delgado and Stefancic 2017). In sum, racism is a normal feature of society that blocks minoritized groups from attaining full citizenship and relief from their suffering under the regime of white supremacy (Ladson-Billings 1998). As a result, critical race theorists are dedicated to a radical critique of the law and to radical emancipation by the law (Bell 1995).

The methodologies of CRT

For critical race theorists, understanding racism is essential to confronting persistent racial inequality in the U.S., especially since the passage of landmark civil rights laws in the 1960s. They demand researchers investigate the role of the law in both the construction of racial categorizations and in perpetuating racial oppression. Additionally, in a normative sense, they imagine how the law might

be used to dismantle discriminatory systems and build better ones in their place. In pursuing such questions via topics like voting rights, race-conscious districting, social welfare, affirmative action, policing, mass imprisonment, and immigration, many CRT scholars add the voices of people of color to their work through the art of storytelling and counter-narrative (Delgado 1989). As a break from orthodox legal scholarship, storytelling interjects “the cultural viewpoints and experiences of marginalized peoples,” thus commanding readers or listeners to “analyse the myths, presuppositions, and received wisdom that make up the common culture about race and that invariably renders blacks and other minorities one-down” (Ladson-Billings 1998, 11). Stories communicate “views to those who hold very different views on the emotionally charged subject of race. People enjoy stories and will often suspend their beliefs, listen to the story, and then compare their views ... with those expressed in the story” (Bell 1995, 902). In essence, storytelling requires audiences to see racial problems from the perspective of marginalized peoples, rather than that of whites.

Another important theoretical and methodological characteristic of much CRT scholarship is intersectionality. In the 1890s, Anna Julia Cooper (1988) argued that Black women were confronted by serious questions on race and gender, but were an unacknowledged factor in both. In the 1970s, the queer Black feminists of the Combahee River Collective explained the interlocking nature of systems of oppression like racism, sexism, classism, and homoantagonism (CRC 2000; Bow et al. 2017). For their part, critical race theorists recognize that many people exist at the crossroads of sites of discrimination, and this raises important questions for the law. “Do such cases require that each disadvantage factor be considered separately, additively, or in yet some other fashion? Should persons who experience multiple forms of oppression have their own categories and representation, apart from those that correspond to the separate varieties of discrimination they experience?” (Delgado and Stefancic 2017, 58). In exploring and exposing the deficiencies of American anti-discrimination law, Crenshaw found that single-axis policies were incapable of providing remedy to those languishing in the intersections of unjust systems. “This focus on the most privi-

leged group members marginalizes those who are multiply-burdened and obscures claims that cannot be understood as resulting from discrete sources of discrimination” (1989, 140). Accordingly, some CRT scholars implore researchers and lawmakers to use intersectional frameworks that disaggregate “group-based formulations such as ‘women,’ ‘people of color,’ and ‘sexual minorities’” (Harris and Leonardo 2018, 5) so they might “do justice to a broad range of people and avoid oversimplifying human experience” (Delgado and Stefancic 2017, 63).

A critique of political science from race, ethnicity, and politics scholars

Some critical race theorists suggest that political scientists now ponder research questions formulated in CRT (Delgado and Stefancic 2017, 7). They also maintain CRT is different from other academic fields because it “contains an activist dimension” (Delgado and Stefancic 2017, 8). Although this might be valid in some instances, scholars of race, ethnicity, and politics were writing about “the race problem” long before the creation of critical race theory. They were also engaged in the struggle for liberation from racial oppression. This is especially true of Black scholars (Wallace et al. 2020). In fighting their own campaign against discrimination in both the society and the profession, Black political scientists established a model for research, teaching, mentoring, and civic engagement that informed the freedom struggles of other marginalized peoples. They sought “to push the boundaries of knowledge and to use that scholarship to ameliorate the adverse conditions confronting Black people in the United States and around the globe” (Belk, Wallace, and Smith 2020, 141). Still, there is more room in political science for “a critical race theoretical perspective” akin to that in legal scholarship (Luck Graham 2007, 213).

The forerunners of race and ethnic politics faced an uphill battle in political science. In attempting to gain the type of public influence exercised by economists, the discipline underwent a process of professionalization that included the creation of the American Political Science Association (APSA) in 1903 and the *American Political Science Review* (APSR) shortly thereafter

(Gunnell 2006). Scholars like John Burgess and William Dunning helped lead that effort, emphasizing objectivity and scientific rigor. However, scholarship does not develop in “epistemological and theoretical vacuums” (Smith 2014). Rather, “all social science is parochial” and the notion of a “universally valid” social science “is nothing more than a testimonial to the power of those dominant forces that are able to force or persuade others to accept their definition of reality and their prescription for the future” (Jones 2014, 35). In this case, McClain et al. (2016, 473) show that Burgess and Dunning subscribed to scientific racism, and believed that Black people were inferior, enslavement was benign, and Reconstruction was a terrible mistake because Black Americans were incapable of handling citizenship or political power. As “founding fathers” of political science, they “played a significant and enduring role in determining what modes of inquiry, or research themes, would be accepted as worthwhile in the discipline” (McClain et al. 2016, 470). In wielding that power, they placed nonwhites “outside the realm of legitimate political science,” thus embedding racism into the very foundation of the discipline. This was reflected in the APSA and leading political science journals. Yet, even today, “there is still a reluctance of some contemporary scholars to engage in REP research or to wholeheartedly support the work of colleagues who are doing research on minority politics” (McClain et al. 2016, 477).

In criticizing the discipline’s poor record of studying people of color and its hostility to those doing so, McClain and Garcia (1993) observed that, for many in the field, such work was considered the purview of “social activists,” not intellectuals. Later, in reviewing attention devoted to “the race variable” in (1) the official and unofficial APSA *State of the Discipline* reports and books from 1907 through 2002, and (2) the basic political science literature on race, Walton and Smith found that “seven decades went by before this variable entered into the official vision of the state of the discipline” (2007, 33). Within these portraits of the field, research on race and ethnic politics was disregarded or deemed separate from core disciplinary concerns. In a more expansive evaluation of major books and articles on the partisanship, voting behavior, policy preferences, and representation of both African Americans

and whites, Hutchings and Valentino noted that work labeled “race and politics” (i.e., white racial attitudes) and research branded as “Black politics” commonly “all but ignore each other” (2004, 401). Walton and Smith added, “many of the scholars on white public opinion and the black conservatives using cutting-edge techniques to analyse this opinion and attitudinal data seek a rollback of governmental programs and policies that advance democratic equality” (2007, 25). Furthermore, in an analysis of articles published in the top three political science journals from 2013 to 2015, McClain et al. (2016, 477) showed that the race and ethnic politics subfield accounted for just 4.5 percent of the 553 items: 13 out of 180 (7.2 percent) in *The American Journal of Political Science*, nine out of 238 (3.8 percent) in the *Journal of Politics*, and three out of 135 (2.2 percent) in the *APSR*. These attitudes and omissions were not limited to American politics. Zvobgo and Loken (2020, 11) contend that while race is a principal organizing feature of global politics, “mainstream international relations scholarship denies race as essential to understanding the world, to the cost of the field’s integrity.” Over the years, leading journals in history and sociology have published more work on race than political science (Wilson 1985; Wilson and Frasure 2007). These trends also help us better understand the formation of new professional organizations (e.g., the National Conference of Black Political Scientists), APSA caucuses, and journals (e.g., *The National Review of Black Politics; Politics, Groups, and Identities*) for scholars dedicated to the study of race and ethnic politics.

Analysing race and racism in political science: lessons from REP scholars

Despite this antagonism, REP scholars continue to extend political science past its typical concerns. This work spans subfields, but is especially evident in American politics, theory, and policy. Black political scientists have long fought racism in the field and to legitimize race scholarship (McClain and Garcia 1993). In recent times, they have deepened our knowledge of politics in major ways. For instance, Tate, Lyles, and Barker (2007) challenged conventional understand-

ings of American institutions by emphasizing the role of race in the founding. The Constitution's framers were greatly influenced by their desire to protect slavery and enslavement was a major factor informing the institutional arrangements they established. Congress, the presidency, and the courts preserved Black subordination through slavery and its remnants. Further, these institutions have delayed the realization of equal rights for Black folk, only producing reforms "in the most drastic of times" (Tate et al. 2007, 391). In another line of research, Dawson (2001) and Harris-Lacewell (2004) delve into the nuances of Black political thought by identifying multiple traditions in Black ideology (from radical egalitarianism to conservatism), exploring how these ideologies are formed in community settings, and how they mold identity and shape behavior. Such scholarship includes exceptional studies of Black feminism and intersectionality as philosophy and a "jurisprudence of resistance" (Jordan-Zachary 2007; Alexander-Floyd 2010; Hancock 2016), thus making space for research on Black women as political actors (Cohen 2005; Simien 2006; Brown 2014; Jordan-Zachary and Alexander-Floyd 2018).

Black scholars have also examined the power of racial appeals in campaigns. Phoenix (2019) clarified the role of anger as a mobilizing force, showing that it had a weaker effect on Black political engagement as compared to whites: "Because white anger is often legitimized and championed by the same discourses, practices and actors that demonize and stigmatize black anger, white people are uniquely able to engender anger over politics and translate it to effective political action" (19). In contrast, Black people are well aware of the likely consequences of displaying their rage, however righteous, and that fear inhibits many from expressing their anger. Ultimately, they are better mobilized through positive emotions like pride or hope, and their voting behavior is shaped by powerful social forces internal to Black communities (White and Laird 2020). Relatedly, Stephan-Dougan (2020) found that Republicans and Democrats engage in "racial distancing" when courting moderate to conservative white voters, using negative appeals to win their support. While politicians can practice racial distancing rhetorically, visually, or substantively, the aim is to signal to whites that they will not disrupt the prevail-

ing racial order or the inequalities it yields. Others have observed that even as office seekers or holders, some Black politicians have deracialized themselves or their policy ideas to appeal to whites (Gillespie 2010; Harris 2012; Price 2016).

REP specialists have also pressed beyond the black/white paradigm to cultivate a more robust understanding of American politics. In the case of Latinx peoples, the development of a Latino/a politics featuring Latino/a political scientists is a recent phenomenon, as there were just four Mexican American PhDs in 1970 (McClain and Garcia 1993). Pioneers in this area offered analyses of Latinx attitudes, behavior, and concerns that were largely absent from the discipline. With that foundation, Latinx politics scholars have elucidated the forces that foster or inhibit a sense of connectedness across Latinx subgroups, identified and explained patterns in Latinx engagement, studied Latinos and Latinas as actors in the electoral arena, and charted the activism of their organizations (Hero 1992; Jones-Correa 1998; Garcia 2003; Rouse 2013; de la Garza et al. 2019). Researchers have added considerable depth to this work by highlighting "the invisible Latina in 'Latino Politics'" (Montoya, Hardy-Fanta, and Gracia 2000; Navarro, Hernandez, and Navarro 2016).

As with Latinx peoples, political science scholarship on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders is a modern development (McClain and Garcia 1993). Also, like their Latinx counterparts, an adequate understanding of AAPI politics "requires attention to global forces and nondomestic developments, as well as non-electoral forms of political activity" (Aoki and Nakanishi 2001). AAPI politics scholars have researched differences within and across various subgroups (e.g., country of origin, foreign-vs. native-born status). They have investigated AAPI political socialization processes, studied the development of ethnic self-identities and pan-ethnicity among groups (especially in response to anti-Asian violence), intersectionality, the acquisition and contours of partisanship, political behavior in electoral and non-electoral settings, interest groups, protest movements, domestic and foreign policy preferences, and more (Lien, Conway, and Wong 2004; Jacob 2006; Aoki and Takeda 2008). AAPI scholars have also taught us that Asian Americans occupy a "third position" in the U.S. racial hierarchy,

“‘triangulated’ vis-à-vis whites and blacks through simultaneous processes of relative valorization and civic ostracism” (Kim and Lee 2001, 633).

Next, a political science centered on American Indians and Alaska Natives still needs further development. While tribal peoples are the original inhabitants of the U.S., they have been “structurally excluded” from the discipline (Ferguson 2016, 1029). There are few Native scholars in American political science departments, few Native issues are considered of central political importance, few Native analyses are regarded as essential to the field, and few texts or speeches by Native intellectuals are assigned in political science courses. Even so, some have dedicated themselves to “unbraiding and closely examining” the quandaries of Native politics, “as well as the issue of treble citizenship for indigenous peoples, the national or sovereign status of indigenous polities, and the federal government’s inconsistent understanding of its relationships to tribes” (Wilkins 2007, 65). Key contributions to Native political theory and politics include, among others, Wilkins (1997), Turner (2006), Bruyneel (2007), and Kessler-Mata (2017). All in all, Native peoples are not “minorities,” but nations. Accordingly, they have a different orientation to the American political system.

Finally, REP scholars have placed policy racism in the spotlight, explaining how reactionary white interests capture American political institutions and direct them to formulate policies that inflict harm on people of color or otherwise produce racially disparate outcomes (Walters 2003, 250). Due to both white supremacy and the negative social constructions of racial minority groups, people of color are frequent targets of punitive policies. States with higher levels of minority diversity or white ethnic diversity are more likely to adopt harsher criminal justice and social welfare measures (Hero 1998). Such actions reflect a longstanding commitment to craft or implement policies in ways that benefit whites to a much greater extent than black and brown people (Williams 2010). It is one thing to dismantle the legislative gains of the civil rights movement, it is another to pursue policies that gut the social welfare state or foster mass imprisonment across the states.

In closing, CRT scholars would benefit from engaging race, ethnicity, and politics specialists because they have done important

work by pursuing questions that other analysts have not.

ADOLPHUS BELK, JR.

References

- Alexander-Floyd, Nikol G. 2010. “Critical Race Black Feminism: A ‘Jurisprudence of Resistance’ and the Transformation of the Academy.” *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 35, no. 4 (Summer): 810–20.
- Aoki, Andrew L., and Don T. Nakanishi. 2001. “Asian Pacific Americans and the New Minority Politics.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 34, no. 3 (September): 605–10.
- Aoki, Andrew L., and Okiyoshi Takeda. 2008. *Asian American Politics*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Belk Jr., Adolphus G., Robert C. Smith, and Sherri L. Wallace. 2020. “Having Their Say, Leaving Their Mark: The Lasting Contributions of NCOBPS and Black Political Scientists to the Political Science Discipline.” *National Review of Black Politics* 1, no. 1 (January): 141–53.
- Bell Jr., Derrick A. 1976. “Serving Two Masters: Integration Ideals and Client Interests in School Desegregation Litigation.” *The Yale Law Journal* 85, no. 4 (March): 470–516.
- Bell Jr., Derrick A. 1979. “Bakke, Minority Admissions, and the Usual Price of Racial Remedies.” *California Law Review* 67, no. 1 (January): 3–19.
- Bell Jr., Derrick A. 1980. “Brown v. Board of Education and the Interest-Convergence Dilemma.” *Harvard Law Review* 93, no. 3 (January): 518–33.
- Bell Jr., Derrick A. 1992. *Faces at the Bottom of the Well: The Permanence of Racism*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bell Jr., Derrick A. 1995. “Who’s Afraid of Critical Race Theory?” *University of Illinois Law Review* 1995, no. 4: 893–910.
- Bow, Leslie, Avtar Brah, Mishuana Goeman, Diane Harriford, Analouise Keating, Yi-Chun Tricia Lin, Laura Pérez et al. 2017. “Combahee River Collective Statement: A Fortieth Anniversary Retrospective.” *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies* 38, no. 3: 164–89.
- Brown, Kevin, and Darrell D. Jackson. 2013. “The History and Conceptual Elements of Critical Race Theory.” In *Handbook of Critical Race Theory in Education*, edited by Marvin Lynn and Adrienne D. Dixon, 29–42. New York: Routledge.
- Brown, Nadia E. 2014. *Sisters in the Statehouse: Black Women and Legislative Decision Making*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bruyneel, Kevin. 2007. *The Third Space of Sovereignty: The Postcolonial Politics of US-Indigenous Relations*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

- Cohen, Cathy J. 2005. "Punks, Bulldaggers, and Welfare Queens: The Radical Potential of Queer Politics?" In *Black Queer Studies: A Critical Anthology*, edited by E. Patrick Johnson and Mae G. Henderson, 21–51. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Combahee River Collective. 2000. "The Combahee River Collective Statement." In *Home Girls: A Black Feminist Anthology*, edited by Barbara Smith, 264–74. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Cooper, Anna J. 1988. *A Voice from the South*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé Williams. 1987. "Race, Reform, and Retrenchment: Transformation and Legitimation in Antidiscrimination Law." *Harvard Law Review* 101, no. 7 (May): 1331–87.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé Williams. 1989. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics." *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 139–67.
- Dawson, Michael C. 2001. *Black Visions: The Roots of Contemporary African-American Political Ideologies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- de la Garza, Rodolfo O., Louis DeSipio, Angelo Falcon, F. Chris Garcia, and John A. Garcia. 2019. *Latino Voices: Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban Perspectives on American Politics*. New York: Routledge.
- Delgado, Richard. 1984. "Imperial Scholar: Reflections on a Review of Civil Rights Literature." *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* 132: 561–78.
- Delgado, Richard. 1989. "Storytelling for Oppositionists and Others: A Plea for Narrative." *Michigan Law Review* 87, no. 8 (August): 2411–41.
- Delgado, Richard, and Jean Stefancic. 2017. *Critical Race Theory: An Introduction*, 3rd edn. New York: New York University Press.
- Ferguson, Kennan. 2016. "Why Does Political Science Hate American Indians?" *Perspectives on Politics* 14, no. 4 (December): 1029–38.
- Freeman, Alan David. 1978. "Legitimizing Racial Discrimination through Antidiscrimination Law: A Critical Review of Supreme Court Doctrine." *Minnesota Law Review* 62: 1049–119.
- Garcia, John A. 2003. *Latino Politics in America: Community, Culture, and Interests*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Gillespie, Andra, ed. 2010. *Whose Black Politics? Cases in Post-Racial Black Leadership*. New York: Routledge.
- Guinier, Lani. 1995. "Groups, Representation, and Race-Conscious Districting: A Case of the Emperor's Clothes." In *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings That Formed the Movement*, edited by Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw, Neil Gotanda, Gary Peller, and Kendall Thomas, 205–34. New York: New Press.
- Gunnell, John G. 2006. "The Founding of the American Political Science Association: Discipline, Profession, Political Theory, and Politics." *American Political Science Review* 100, no. 4 (November): 479–86.
- Hancock, Ange-Marie. 2016. *Intersectionality: An Intellectual History*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Harris, Angela, and Zeus Leonardo. 2018. "Intersectionality, Race-Render Subordination, and Education." *Review of Research in Education* 42, no. 1: 1–27.
- Harris, Cheryl I. 1993. "Whiteness as Property." *Harvard Law Review* 106, no. 8: 1707–91.
- Harris, Fredrick. 2012. *The Price of the Ticket: Barack Obama and Rise and Decline of Black Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Harris-Lacewell, Melissa Victoria. 2004. *Barbershops, Bibles, and BET: Everyday Talk and Black Political Thought*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hero, Rodney. 1992. *Latinos and the US Political System: Two-Tiered Pluralism*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Hero, Rodney. 1998. *Faces of Inequality: Social Diversity in American Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hutchings, Vincent L., and Nicholas A. Valentino. 2004. "The Centrality of Race in American Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 7: 383–408.
- Jacob, Anil G. 2006. "Asian American Political Participation: Research Challenges for an Emerging Minority." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 39, no. 1 (January): 103–06.
- Jones, Mack H. 2014. *Knowledge, Power, and Black Politics: Collected Essay*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Jones-Correa, Michael. 1998. *Between Two Nations: The Political Predicament of Latinos in New York City*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Jordan-Zachery, Julia S. 2007. "Am I a Black Woman or a Woman Who is Black? A Few Thoughts on the Meaning of Intersectionality." *Politics & Gender* 3, no. 2 (2007): 254–63.
- Jordan-Zachery, Julia S., and Nikol G. Alexander-Floyd, eds. 2018. *Black Women in Politics: Demanding Citizenship, Challenging Power, and Seeking Justice*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Kessler-Mata, Kouslaa T. 2017. *American Indians and the Trouble with Sovereignty: A Turn Toward Structural Self-Determination*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kim, Claire Jean, and Taeku Lee. 2001. "Interracial Politics: Asian Americans and Other Communities of Color." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 34, no. 3 (September): 631–7.
- Ladson-Billings, Gloria. 1998. "Just What Is Critical Race Theory and What's It Doing In A Nice Field Like Education?" *International*

- Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 11, no. 1: 7–24.
- Lawrence III, Charles R. 1987. "The Id, the Ego, and Equal Protection: Reckoning with Unconscious Racism." *Stanford Law Review* 39, no. 2 (January): 317–88.
- Lien, Pei-Te, M. Margaret Conway, and Janelle Wong. 2004. *The Politics of Asian Americans: Diversity and Community*. New York: Routledge.
- Lopez, Ian Haney. 1997. *White by Law: The Legal Construction of Race*. New York: New York University Press.
- Luck Graham, Barbara. 2007. "Toward a Critical Race Theory of Political Science: A New Synthesis for Understanding Race, Law, and Politics." In *African American Perspectives on Political Science*, edited by Wilbur C. Rich, 212–31. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Matsuda, Mari J. 1987. "Looking to the Bottom: Critical Legal Studies and Reparations." *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Review* 22: 323–99.
- McClain, Paula D., and John A. Garcia. 1993. "Expanding Disciplinary Boundaries: Black, Latino, and Racial Minority Group Politics in Political Science." In *Political Science: The State of the Discipline II*, edited by James Farr and Raymond Seidelman, 247–79. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- McClain, Paula D., Gloria YA Ayee, Taneisha N. Means, Alicia M. Reyes-Barrientez, and Nura A. Sedique. 2016. "Race, Power, and Knowledge: Tracing the Roots of Exclusion in the Development of Political Science in the United States." *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 4, no. 3 (April): 467–82.
- Montoya, Lisa J., Carol Hardy-Fanta, and Sonia Garcia. 2000. "Latina Politics: Gender, Participation, and Leadership." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 33 (September): 555–62.
- Navarro, Sharon A., Samantha L. Hernandez, and Leslie A. Navarro. 2016. *Latinas in American Politics: Changing and Embracing Political Tradition*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Price, Melanye T. 2016. *The Race Whisperer: Barack Obama and the Political Uses of Race*. New York: New York University Press.
- Rollock, Nicola, and David Gillborn. 2011. "Critical Race Theory (CRT)." *British Educational Research Association*. Available at Critical-Race-Theory-CRT-.pdf.
- Rouse, Stella M. 2013. *Latinos in the Legislative Process: Interests and Influence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Simien, Evelyn M. 2006. *Black Feminist Voices in Politics*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Smith, Robert C. 2014. "Foreword." In *Knowledge, Power, and Black Politics: Collected Essays*, edited by Mack Jones. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Stephens-Dougan, LaFleur. 2020. *Race to the Bottom: How Racial Appeals Work in American Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tate, Katherine, Kevin L. Lyles, and Lucius J. Barker. 2007. "A Critical Review of American Political Institutions: Reading Race into the Constitutional 'Silence' on Race." In *African American Perspectives on Political Science*, edited by Wilbur C. Rich, 364–97. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Taylor, Edward. 1998. "A Primer on Critical Race Theory: Who Are the Critical Race Theorists and What Are They Saying?" *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education* 19 (Spring): 122–4.
- Turner, Dale Antony. 2006. *This is Not a Peace Pipe: Towards a Critical Indigenous Philosophy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Wallace, Sherri L., Robert C. Smith, Adolphus G. Belk Jr, Gloria Braxton, Charisse Burden-Stelly, Tasha S. Philpot, and Wendy Smooth. 2020. "Chronicling Our Legacy of Leadership: The Task Force Historical Record on the Founders of the National Conference of Black Political Scientists." *National Review of Black Politics* 1, no. 1 (January): 80–131.
- Walton Jr., Hanes C. and Robert C. Smith. "The Race Variable and the American Political Science Association's *State of the Discipline* Reports and Books, 1997–2002." In *African American Perspectives on Political Science*, edited by Wilbur C. Rich, 24–37. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Wilkins, David E. 1997. *American Indian Sovereignty and the US Supreme Court: The Masking of Justice*. Austin: The University of Texas Press.
- Wilkins, David E. 2007. *American Indian Politics and the American Political System*, 2nd edn. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Williams, Linda Faye. 2010. *The Constraint of Race: Legacies of White Skin Privilege in America*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Williams, Patricia J. 1990. "Metro Broadcasting, Inc. v. FCC: Regrouping in Singular Times." *Harvard Law Review* 104, vol. 2 (December): 525–46.
- Wilson III, Ernest J. 1985. "Why Political Scientists Don't Study Black Politics, but Historians and Sociologists Do." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 18, no. 3 (Summer): 600–07.
- Wilson III, Ernest J. and Lorrie A. Frasure. 2007. "Still at the Margins: The Persistence of Neglect of African American Issues in Political Science, 1986–2003." In *African American Perspectives on Political Science*, edited by Wilbur C. Rich, 7–23. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Zvobgo, Kelebogile, and Meredith Loken. 2020. "Why Race Matters in International Relations." *Foreign Policy* 237 (June): 11–13. <https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/06/19/why-race-matters-international-relations-ir/>.

Further readings

Brown-Dean, Khalilah L. 2019. *Identity Politics in the United States*. Medford, MA: Polity Press.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé Williams, Neil Gotanda, Gary Peller, and Kendall Thomas, eds. 1995.

Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings That Formed the Movement. New York: New Press.

Shaw, Todd, Louis DeSipio, Dianne Pinderhughes, and Toni-Michelle C. Travis. 2018.

Uneven Roads: An Introduction to US Racial and Ethnic Politics. Thousand Oaks, CA: CQ Press.

33. Latinx politics

Some of the first scholarship that would eventually become known as Latinx politics, broadly speaking, consisted of the scholarship produced within Chicano studies. These works examined the political struggles of ethnic Mexicans both inside and outside the electoral arena and focused primarily on the Southwest United States (García 1997). These early studies examined significant events, such as the rise of La Raza Unida Party, a third party which challenged the dominance of the U.S. two party system (García 1989). Much of this scholarship took historical approaches that used archival research and oral history to document the rise of Mexican American and Chicano politics (Gómez-Quinones 1990, Acuña 1997). Many of these scholars emerged from the movements themselves. Other more theoretically driven perspectives examined how Mexican communities became wage-laborers through primitive accumulation (Montejano 1987), thus illustrating the asymmetrical social and political context where Chicano politics emerged. Mario Barrera, one of the first Chicanos trained as a political scientist, uses a Marxian theory of the state to explain how Mexicans in the Southwest came to occupy a position in the political economy as a segmented class due to their marginalization as exploited wage-laborers and as racialized second-class subjects.

Over time, the study of Mexican American and Chicano politics continued to develop alongside another intellectual tradition that came to be known as Latinx politics, a subfield within the larger discipline of political science. The development of Latinx politics complemented and added to the study of Latino communities in ways distinct from those of Mexican American historiography and Chicano studies. Latinx politics has contributed to our knowledge of Latinx communities in distinct ways, especially our understanding of public opinion and political attitudes. For example, the pioneering work of Rodolfo de la Garza, Angelo Falcon, F. Chris Garcia, and John A. Garcia in their 1989–90 Latino National Survey (LNS) generated a dataset which political scientists, and other social scientists, have utilized to examine the political attitudes and behaviors of Latino communities. As the first national

survey of its kind, the Latino National Survey disaggregated “Latinx” by examining the three largest Latinx communities at the time: Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans.

A newer version of this survey (Fraga et al. 2006) continues to provide social scientists with a significant sample size (N=8634) of self-identified Latinx interviewees. This survey contains approximately 165 distinct variables ranging from demographic information to party preference and political ideology. The methodological strength of the LNS, and similar surveys with large samples, is the ability to capture the political attitudes and viewpoints of Latinx populations from various Latin American nationalities, across generations and those residing within specific geographic regions within the U.S. Quantitative approaches, such as survey research, multivariate, correlational, and other types of statistical analyses, continue to increasingly dominate the field of political science writ large, the subfield of Latinx politics included.

The methodological strength of survey research, which Latinx politics generally utilizes, poses limitations due to its focus on attitudes and political behavior at the individual level. The types of questions that such surveys ask, due to their conceptualization, do not capture the nuances of phenomenon as transnationalism, race and ethnicity, specific geographic origin beyond the nation-state, and political commitments outside traditional party systems. At some level these questions were included in the LNS, but they were not able to capture the immense heterogeneity of Latino communities. While these samples provide a sense of the Latinx population’s opinion on salient issues, this method poses limitations since the data is not historically situated. Although survey research and experiments lend themselves to testing correlational and causal relationships, these methods pose further limitations because of their narrow capacity for “understanding the macro-structural and historical processes that structure the political system that Latinos actually engage in” (Gonzales 2017, 160). This is not to dismiss the achievements of Latinx politics scholars whose work is commendable, but only to underscore that the goal of achieving breadth and generalizability falls short of capturing rich nuances within Latinx communities and the ways in which they come to understand themselves and their

relationship to states which have historically marginalized them.

The dialectical tension between agency and social structure is a concern taken up by Latinx politics scholars whose research moves beyond the hegemonic paradigms of political science (García-Bedolla 2005, Beltrán 2010, Gonzales 2014, Rocco 2014, Sampaio 2015, Felix 2019). Such standpoints to Latinx politics have enlarged our theoretical understanding of why Latinx populations interact, or not, with the traditional institutions of the state and provide us with insights which complicate our understanding of Latinx communities and the Latinx electorate. A cross-section of scholars working within various methodological traditions will be discussed in the remainder of this entry.

Gender, grassroots activism, and Latinx politics

Some qualitative approaches to Latinx politics have focused on grassroots political organizing at the community level among Latinas (Hardy-Fanta 1993, Pardo 1998). These studies analysed the role neighborhood actors such as Latina women played in campaigning on behalf of candidates for local office. For example, Pardo investigates how Latinas from two East Los Angeles neighborhoods organized to prevent the construction of a prison in their community. These studies are important because they invert traditional understandings of political science by looking at how power is built from the site of civil society. Their work argues that dominant theoretical paradigms did not possess the explanatory power to analyse the phenomenon under examination. Prior frameworks had conceived of politics from an elitist perspective where politics becomes a matter of powerful figures engaged in struggles over power as individuals divorced from their respective communities. Latina women's engagement in political work demonstrates a view and understanding of "politics" distinct from dominant frameworks based on white male understandings of how power functions, and male Latinos' focus on vying for leadership roles. By departing from an understanding that power is strictly located within the dominant political institutions of the state, Pardo and Hardy-Fanta focus their attention away from strictly examining the behaviors of voter-turnout and towards the

quotidian processes of building power at the grassroots within civil society.

Identity and *Latinidad*

Other studies of Latinx politics have examined the intersection of Latinx identity, political behavior, and grassroots activism (García-Bedolla 2005, Beltrán, 2010). A common thread in these studies is the way in which "Latinx" identity is mobilized for political purposes. In *Fluid Borders: Latino Power, Identity and Politics in Los Angeles*, Lisa García-Bedolla makes a critical intervention in the field of political science. Contrary to past social science research which emphasized the relationship between socioeconomic status and political participation (i.e. voting), García-Bedolla argues that within particular social and geographic contexts individuals can develop a "mobilizing identity." García-Bedolla's intervention challenges the mainstream literature in political science, which claims that only those who occupy a higher socioeconomic status and who are more educated will normally engage in political activity. In contrast, García-Bedolla found that among Latinx immigrants and their children in two Los Angeles neighborhoods, it is possible for these individuals to develop a mobilizing identity. García-Bedolla illustrates how a mobilizing identity can develop among social groups whose personal experiences are shaped by racism and xenophobia. Any analysis of political engagement must include the dialectic between structure and agency. Only then can we understand how political engagement is situated at the intersection of "collective identity and structural position" (García Bedolla 2005, 3).

In *The Trouble with Unity: Latino Politics and the Creation of Identity*, Cristina Beltrán offers a nuanced understanding of *Latinidad*. Beltrán argues that such broad and overly comprehensive categories as "Latinx" and "Hispanic" have very little explanatory power. Beltrán explains that *Latinidad* has been an effort to expose historical "group-based inequality" and has jointly served as a platform from which to speak out collectively against racial and ethnic discrimination. Such categories have served as the basis from which to engage in collective politics and make group-based demands for social and economic resources. Simultaneously, these categories are inherently limited because they collapse

racial, ethnic, gender, and political diversity within the group in the name of commonality. For example, Beltrán highlights that within the Chicano movement, women's needs and those of the queer community were silenced. Beltrán urges researchers that use categories such as "Latinx" should be "reconceived as a site of permanent political contestation" (2010, 9). The category Latinx should undergo a process of "on-going resignifiability" and ought to serve as a political rather than merely descriptive category. Beltrán analyses electoral and protest politics and provides a "critical and theoretically driven account of how political power, racial/ethnic identity, and ideological diversity have been theorized and debated within U.S. Latino politics" by engaging with democratic theory (2010, 10).

Subaltern Latinx politics

The subaltern school of thought critiques the hegemonic approaches to Latinx politics. The approaches used by mainstream political scientists take for granted that the liberal democratic institutions of the U.S. emerged from a particular mode of production established on colonization and racial capitalism. Starting from the basis that the struggle over power is never a harmonious process, but one inherently antagonistic, the subaltern school of thought situates its analysis within social struggle itself. A subaltern approach is invested in transforming the social hierarchies that maintain race and class privileges and eschews false claims of objectivity taken up by mainstream social scientists. However, this research is by no means less intellectually rigorous in its examination of politics and enhances the analysis by way of immersion within working-class Latinx struggles (Gonzales 2018).

Raymond Rocco (2014) illustrates in his book, *Transforming Citizenship: Democracy, Membership, and Belonging in Latino Communities*, how Latino communities in Los Angeles were transformed as the result of neoliberal urban restructuring, and how they engaged in distinct forms of citizenship within civil society. Through ethnographic research that is theoretically driven, Rocco argues that Latino communities strive to exert their power within and against democratic institutions which function within a neoliberal mode of production. Latinx communi-

ties have and continue to exercise political power within the informal networks of civil society and through the formal institutions of the public sphere. Because Latinx communities continue to lack belonging in the body politic due to their "inclusionary exclusion" and racialized alterity, they enact citizenship within the "submerged networks of everyday life" (Rocco 2014). This practice of citizenship within civil society is enacted as an active practice, as opposed to citizenship as a static legal category. Because civil society is a permanent site of contestation, it is a key space of social transformation since political and ideological hegemony is fragile.

Alfonso Gonzales (2014), author of *Reform without Justice: Latino Migrant Politics and the Homeland Security State*, uses a neo-Gramscian framework to explain how a diverse set of social forces constructed migration control policies during the post 9/11 homeland security state. Gonzales' approach to Latinx politics employs a conjunctural analysis to understand how the homeland security state coalesced a set of class forces. Gonzales argues migrant rights activists, primarily Latinx communities, were at a disadvantage since they were up against a powerful constellation of forces he calls the "anti-immigrant bloc." This bloc was constituted by state and non-state actors within civil society. These actors included legislators, right-wing think tanks, organic intellectuals, and media pundits who set the parameters of the immigration debate around "narrow questions of criminality and anti-terrorism" (Gonzales 2014, 5). These discourses had such a powerful effect that sectors of the "migrant rights bloc" participated in the "good immigrant/bad immigrant" debate which ultimately legitimized legal violence against immigrants and further reinforced their "illegality." Gonzales underscores the dual nature of civil society as a perpetual site of political conflict where the struggle over the moral and intellectual *common-sense* is fought. Using the concept of civil society in the Gramscian sense, Gonzales argues that the hegemony of the dominant classes can be reinforced or replaced with a hegemony that advances the interests of subaltern Latinx groups and the working-class more generally.

Paul Apostoldis (2019) in his book, *The Fight for Time: Migrant Day Laborers and the Politics of Precarity*, argues that due to *pre-caritization*, migrant day laborers negoti-

ate some of the worst working conditions in the U.S. Apostolidis' approach to understanding migrant day-laborers' quotidian struggles with precarity, and subaltern Latinx politics more generally, exemplifies how Latinx migrants come to theorize their own precarious material conditions. In his ethnographic study, male Latinx migrants from Mexico and Central America theorize their own condition as racialized workers on the margins of the economy. These workers also provide us with insights into the material conditions which impact the entire working-class. Apostolidis describes precarity as a "near universal complex of unfreedom" (2019, 2). Since racial capitalism devalues the labor of particular social classes such as Latinx day-laborers, they become a racialized segment of the working-class who are superexploited. Nevertheless, these migrant laborers share a general experience with other sectors of the working-class. In this case, an emerging politics of anti-precarity is located within civil society at the site of day-labor centers.

Transnational civil society

Other scholars (Fox and Salgado 2004, Smith and Baker 2008, Bada 2014, Félix 2019) focus on the political and social ties which Latinx migrants maintain across the hemisphere. These studies depart from traditional approaches to the study of Latinx politics which limit their unit of analysis to the nation-state. They underscore the transnational nature of Latinx politics but, more generally, the global character of civil society and the public sphere. They challenge the idea that "Latinx politics" is a domestic phenomenon based on what sociologists call "methodological nationalism." And they stress how migrants maintain ongoing social and political commitments to national politics across borders and political ties to indigenous communities as in the case of Oaxacan migrants from Mexico (Fox and Salgado 2004).

In his book, *Specters of Belonging: The Political Life Cycle of Mexican Migrants*, Adrián Félix (2019) demonstrates, through thick ethnographic description, how Mexican migrants within the citizenship classroom develop critiques of U.S. empire as they go through the process of naturalization. Migrants within the citizenship classroom

contest and expose the contradictions of U.S. democracy by articulating their own "exclusionary inclusion" (Rocco 2014) into the U.S. body politic as racialized subjects. Félix displays how Mexican migrants from different regions in Mexico, and to a lesser extent Latin America, use the space of the classroom to contest dominant narratives about assimilation and U.S. imperial citizenship. Migrants do so to negotiate "transnational political belonging and membership" (Félix 2019, 24). Félix argues that "the citizenship class functions as an alternative public space where migrants develop a counternarrative that exposes the arbitrariness of the naturalization process, creating a transnational, rather than assimilative, relationship to citizenship and national identity" (2019, 25). Ultimately, this study is about the transnationalization of civil society and the public sphere.

Latino laboring classes and the next left

Others such as Armando Ibarra, Alfredo Carlos, and Rodolfo D. Torres (2018) emphasize the relationship between race, place, and capital. In the book, *The Latino Question: Politics, Laboring Classes and the Next Left*, they argue that urban, and semi-urban, geographies are critical sites in which to study the political struggles of Latinx laboring classes. By taking a critical look at the forces of capitalism which structure the material conditions of Latinx communities, Ibarra et al. critique past approaches to Latinx politics which examine Latino communities as if they are monolithic voting blocs or a "sleeping giant." They argue that Latinx populations have varying class and ideological differences which mediate the ways in which they approach politics as a social class. For example, Ibarra et al. point to the fact that almost 30 percent of Latinx voters selected Donald Trump and that mainstream approaches to Latinx politics failed to account for Trump supporters. For instance, they ask "how can we speak of the 'Latino Vote' as if 'Latino' is one unifying category? The reality is we can't and shouldn't; it is just poor social science. More importantly, focusing on this conversation obscures more pressing questions about what types of experiences unify or differentiate groups of people meaningfully" (Ibarra et al. 2018, 8). Moreover, they argue that working-class Latinx communities need to be squarely at

the center of debates related to labor struggles since they are asking questions about how to alter the social relations of the state which continue to keep them at the margins.

Conclusion

A critical approach to Latinx politics will have to begin from an analysis that large segments of Latinx communities continue to hold precarious positions in society and the political economy through “exclusionary inclusion.” Such approaches will be generative not only to the field of political science, but other cutting-edge fields such as Latinx Studies interested in questions of power, belonging, and citizenship which continue to be pressing issues for Latinx populations. Future research will also have to account for the multiple levels of subalternity and subjectivities within the Latinx community without losing sight of historical processes and macro-structural forces which homogenize and criminalize entire populations perceived to be “Latinx.” For example, work from interdisciplinary fields such as Ethnic Studies, Central American Studies, and Latinx Geographies are generating important insights into the distinct subjectivities which constitute the Latinx community such as Indigenous Latinx, Afro-Latinx, and Queer Latinx communities. What will be important to keep in mind is how this diverse community will be able to find points of commonality within the community itself and with other marginal groups without engaging in what public intellectual Roberto Lovato terms “intersectional empire.” Although much important work has been generated which examines such phenomena as co-ethnic candidates and Latinx voter-turnout, a critical approach to Latinx politics will have to seriously interrogate symbolic representation versus substantive representation. Such an honest self-criticism will have to question the limits to transformative change that Latinx elected officials, and public policy, can make within the dominant political institutions of the state. A critical approach to Latinx politics should maintain a commitment to approaching politics with the end goal of challenging structures of power and academic enterprises which seek to justify the ongoing exploitation of marginal groups, and which frame U.S. democracy as an ensemble of neutral institutions based on “checks and

balances” which operate outside an ongoing history of colonization, racial capitalism, and white supremacy.

JULIO ORELLANA

References

- Acuña, Rodolfo. 2000. *Occupied America: A History of Chicanos*. 4th edn. Boston: Longman.
- Bada, Xóchitl. 2014. *Mexican Hometown Associations in Chicagoacán: From Local to Transnational Civic Engagement*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Barrera, Mario. 1979. *Race and Class in the Southwest: A Theory of Racial Inequality*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Beltrán, Cristina. 2010. *The Trouble with Unity: Latino Politics and the Creation of Identity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Félix, Adrián. 2019. *Specters of Belonging: The Political Life Cycle of Mexican Migrants*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fox, Jonathan, and Salgado, Raul. “Indigenous Mexican Migrants in the United States.” In *Indigenous Mexican Migrants in the United States*, edited by Jonathan Fox and Gaspar Rivera Salgado, 1–64. La Jolla: University of California, San Diego, Center for Comparative Immigration Studies, 2004.
- Fraga, Luis R., John A. Garcia, Rodney Hero, Michael Jones-Correa, Valerie Martinez-Ebers, and Gary M. Segura. Latino National Survey (LNS) Focus Group Data, 2006.
- Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2015-08-19. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR29601.v1>.
- García-Bedolla, Lisa. 2005. *Fluid Borders: Latino Power, Identity and Politics in Los Angeles*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- García M., Ignacio. 1997. *Chicanismo: The Forging of a Militant Ethos among Mexican Americans*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.
- García M., Ignacio. 1998. *United We Win: The Rise and Fall of La Raza Unida Party*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.
- Gómez-Quíñones, Juan. 1990. *Chicano Politics: Reality and Promise 1940–1990*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Gonzales, Alfonso. 2014. *Reform without Justice: Latino Migrant Politics and the Homeland Security State*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gonzales, Alfonso. 2017. “Trumpism, Authoritarian Neoliberalism, and Subaltern Latina/o Politics.” *Aztlán: A Journal of Chicano Studies* 42, no. 2: 147–64.
- Gonzales, Alfonso. 2018. “Nuestro Gramsci: Notes on Antonio Gramsci’s Theoretical Relevance for the Study of Subaltern Latino Politics Research.” *Rethinking Marxism* 30, no. 4: 546–67.
- Hardy-Fanta, Carol. 1993. *Latina Politics*,

- Latino Politics: Gender, Culture and Political Participation in Boston*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Ibarra, Armando, Alfredo Carlos, and Rodolfo D. Torres. 2018. *The Latino Question: Politics, Labouring Classes and the Next Left*. London: Pluto Press.
- Montejano, David. 1987. *Anglos and Mexican Americans in the Making of Texas, 1836–1986*. Austin: The University of Texas Press.
- Pardo, Mary. 1998. *Mexican American Women Activists: Identity and Resistance in Two Los Angeles Communities*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Rocco, Raymond. 2014. *Transforming Citizenship: Democracy, Membership, and Belonging in Latino Communities*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.
- Sampaio, Anna. 2015. *Terrorizing Latina/o Immigrants: Race, Gender, and Immigration Politics in the Age of Security*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Smith, Michael Peter and Matt Bakker. 2008. *Citizenship across Borders: The Political Transnationalism of El Migrante*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

See also

Latino Politics and Marxism; Hegemony; Immigration; Migration; Racialization; Ethnicity

34. Ecology and environmental theory

A comprehensive overview of the methods, approaches, and concepts necessary to document the ideas and practices influencing crucial developments in a “critical political science” in the United States (Ricci 1984; Barrow 2017; Barrow 2022) must include ecology and environmental theory. Critical political science neither places an exclusive claim on one method, ideology, or school of thought (Monroe 2005; Macdonald 2022), nor does it corral its practitioners behind more conventional mainstream disciplinary boundaries as they articulate wide-ranging critiques of culture, economy, governance, technology, and society (Schram 2006). At the same time, ecological criticism and environmental political theory are comparably eclectic (Gottlieb 2005). Appraising how and why these two fields of scholarly research cut related, if not parallel, channels of critical analysis into the rough terrain of today’s inequitable and irrational economic and political systems is a worthwhile project. Specifically, one must begin to map out the biased social institutions, brittle technological regimes, and bloated state structures that enable the development and reproduction of systemic inequity and irrationality to operate through their political ecologies and human-made environments (Luke 1997).

As politically engaged intellectual traditions, ecological criticism and environmental theory continue to spark intense flashes of political ferment, protest, and revolt by many political and social movements that oppose the inequity and waste endemic to the embedded economic and political order knit between modern capitalist exchange and oppressive state bureaucracy. Whether they are tied to programs for utopian socialism, anarchism, rustic traditionalism, Marxism, settlement reformism, futurism, agrarian democracy, Leninism, technocracy, anarcho-syndicalism, localism, liberation theology, eco-modernization, future primitivism, Maoism, council communism, accelerationism, green statism, ruralism, and/or environmental justice, a holistic analysis of ecological criticism and environmental theory is crucial, even if many of its activists have been largely agents of “a polite revolution” (Dowie 1995,

1–8). Each of these movements in their own fashion has sought to resist the trajectories of embedded authoritarianism, inequalities, and injustice that suppress their efforts to imagine and build a new society grounded in ecological diversity and environmental resilience (Mitchell 2011).

Believing a holistic and systemic approach to ecologies and environments will enable their advocates to cultivate deeper knowledge and greater understanding of the established economic and social order, ecology and environmental theory along with the political movements they inspire must be included in the work of critical political science. The establishment of “the modern world system” comes with the crystallization of capitalist agriculture’s commodification of the earth and its natural resources to feed the populace of growing cities, nations, and empires in late medieval or early modern times of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (Wallerstein 2011, 2–65). Not all ecological or environmental thinkers are devoted to progressive practices, but most have contributed to the still ongoing struggles to either speed up, slow, or stop the domination of nature and humanity that rends of the Earth’s ecology. In turn, their activities have contributed to the development of many visions for creating more democratic and egalitarian configurations of economic, social, and political order. The ultimate outcomes for such an alternative order are not easy to realize, but their essential elements resonate in the same conceptual and ethical registers – how human and non-human life might thrive without systematic class exploitation, institutionalized racism, widespread nonhuman extinction, degrading sexism, rapacious global imperialism, barbaric dehumanizing culture and catastrophic environmental destruction (Luke 1999; Klein 2014).

The embrace of “Nature” as a key normative basis of the economy and society is found in many ancient and other cultures around the world. Yet, “the natures” extolled by each of these cultures are not always identical in their ethical directives or ontological roots (Soper 1995). Making a detailed comparison of texts, like the Egyptian *Book of the Dead*, the Four Vedas, Hesiod’s *Theogony*, the *Tao Te Ching*, the *Tanakh*, Aristotle’s *Ethics*, the *Popul Vuh*, the Quran and Sunnah, the *Snorra Edda*, the Aztec codices, or the oral teachings of indigenous peoples in Africa,

Asia, Australia, and the Americas, one soon realizes there is considerable diversity in human thought (Merchant 2016) about “Nature.” Consequently, each agent and new generations from all cultures should take this epistemic, moral ontological diversity in how “Nature” is known elsewhere by others into fuller account in their own ethical and technical actions. In many ways, more recent medieval Christian readings of Platonic and Aristotelian thought in Thomistic teachings or Islamic philosophical commentaries from Al-Ghazali, Al-Farabi, Ibn Sina, and Ibn Khaldun, which richly synthesize Quranic thinking with Muslim translations of ancient and medieval European philosophy as well as their contemporaneous empirical observations, historical comparisons, and structural analyses exemplify these variations as they begin to address Nature’s influence on human consciousness as well as the economy and society during earlier eras of world commerce (Dien 1990; Abu-Lughod 1991; Kassiola 2003; Hoffman 2014).

The dawn of the capitalist world system during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, however, abruptly contravenes the dominance of “Nature” as the foundational normative basis of the economy and society as the mores of markets acquired greater hegemony in the violence of primitive capitalist accumulation. Hiding in new myths about the “state of nature,” the demonic forces generated by money, power, and violence imposed starkly different ways of life in their dialectics of accumulation and deaccumulation, which became “solitary, poore, nasty, brutish, and short” for far too many people (Hobbes 2004 [1651], 92). The ruthless pursuit by aggressively powerful agents to control “the life, the liberty, health, limb or goods of another” fabricated a spurious pretext to dispossess other peoples’ enjoyment of the earth. By presuming others were not using such assets to the fullest in their society’s pursuits to enjoy the “property” the rich and powerful conjured up the license to mix their labor in regions with underutilized resources from the earth (Locke 2015, 34), which led them to assail all those they could eliminate, enslave, or indenture in this quest. This reduction of the earth and the debasement of its various populations of human and nonhuman life, as Rousseau (2018 [1755], 29) claimed, truly forged whole new ecologies out of countless violent acts in which

the first man, who, after enclosing a piece of ground took it into his head to say, “This is mine,” and found people simple enough to believe him, he was the founder of civil society. How many crimes, how many wars, how many murders, how many misfortunes and horrors, would that man have saved the human species who pulling up the stakes or filling in the ditches should have cried to his fellows; Be sure not to listen to this impostor; you are lost, if you forget the fruits of the earth belong equally to us all, and the earth itself to nobody!

Both critical and reactionary understandings of ecology and environment turn on this closing of the open commons of the Earth by constructing vast preserves of positional privilege for the rich and powerful drawn behind lines dug deeply by violence against the poor and powerless. These actions also disclose how “the nature of the state” with its means of coercive domination provide the kernel of control allegedly absent in “state of nature” during decades of primitive accumulation and forced manufacture. As “the wealth of nations,” which formed with the modern world system, was first being gained and lost (Smith 2000) in the West during the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries, Hobbes, Locke, Hume, Smith, and Rousseau all recounted the generation of their genesis in philosophical parables about how the domination of Nature also advanced the domination of human and nonhuman life by Society.

The emergence of modern ecological science and environmental thought, however, is also largely an eighteenth and nineteenth century project first associated with the meticulous research and extensive fieldwork of Carl Linnaeus, Alexander von Humboldt, or Charles Darwin whose examinations of metabolic webs in ecosystems, the biodiversity of habitats, and variations among species also emerged from the cultural milieu of the modern world system. Its grounding in this existing economic and social order moved Linnaeus, von Humboldt and Darwin to each develop their new discourses about “Nature’s economy” (Worster 1994; Merchant 2016). In addition to shifting scholarship into new scientific research paradigms, their scientific ideas were drawn into political debates. Class and regional conflicts about the monocultural exhaustion of soil, the burden of soul-crushing labor, the exploitative and unhealthy conditions faced by factory workers were enflamed

by political clashes created by the rapid rise of fossil-fuel powered industrial capitalism in global empires created by a handful of nation-states located around the North Atlantic. These events were a profound economic and social transformation. They rested atop worldwide ecological colonization and environmental destruction that accelerated during the “Age of Exploration” by European traders, who after

the rounding of the Cape, opened up fresh ground for the rising bourgeoisie. The East-Indian and Chinese markets, the colonisation of America, trade with the colonies, the increase in the means of exchange and in commodities generally, gave to commerce, to navigation, to industry, an impulse never before known, and thereby ... steam and machinery revolutionised industrial production. The place of manufacture was taken by the giant, Modern Industry; the place of the industrial middle class by industrial millionaires, the leaders of the whole industrial armies, the modern bourgeois. Modern industry has established the world market, for which the discovery of America paved the way (Marx and Engels 1969 [1848], 15).

At this historical juncture, one saw the first systematic developments of a “critical political science” that also included the project of anarchist, socialist, or communist thinkers, like Kropotkin (1904 [1902]), Bernstein (1961 [1899]) or Engels (1902 [1884]), who presented their political criticism in systems of scientific reasoning inspired by the research into “the economy of nature” by Linnaeus, von Humboldt, and Darwin. While these efforts were welcomed elsewhere in the world, such critical concepts and methods largely were, and still are, resisted in the U.S. (Ricci 1984, 99–175).

Nonetheless, contemporary critical political scientists, despite endless debates about many details, tend to appreciate today how the structures of capitalist modernity underlying the existing economic and social order

cannot exist without constantly revolutionising the instruments of production, and thereby the relations of production, and with them the whole relations of society ... Constant revolutionising of production, uninterrupted disturbance of all social conditions, everlasting uncertainty and agitation distinguish the bourgeois epoch from all earlier ones. All fixed, fast-frozen relations, with their train of

ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are swept away, all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify. All that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned, and man is at last compelled to face with sober senses his real conditions of life, and his relations with his kind. The need of a constantly expanding market for its products chases the bourgeoisie over the entire surface of the globe. It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish connexions everywhere ... In place of the old wants, satisfied by the production of the country, we find new wants, requiring for their satisfaction the products of distant lands and climes. In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction, universal inter-dependence of nations. In one word, it creates a world after its own image (Marx and Engels 1969 [1848], 16).

The natural world created in the image of capitalist exchange since the nineteenth century already was one plagued by resource exhaustion and biodiversity loss. As George Perkins Marsh observed over 150 years ago, conversationists around the world already were starting to survey

the character, and approximately the extent of the changes produced by human actions on the globe that we inhabit; to point to the conditions of imprudence and the necessity of caution in all of the physical changes, which on a large scale, interfere with the spontaneous arrangements of the organic or inorganic world; to suggest the importance of the restoration of the disturbed harmonies and the material improvement of waste and exhausted regions (Marsh 1874, iii).

Despite the advances made during the early twentieth century by more scientific techniques of mineral extraction, range management, woodlands protection and wildlife conservation, too little material improvement of industrialized waste and regional devastation has been realized over the past four or five generations (Worster 1994; Dowie 1995; Gottlieb 2005).

More radical interventions since the 1950s and 1960s by social ecology (Bookchin 1971), ecological Marxism (Foster 2002), deep ecology (Devall and Sessions 1985), bioregional communitarianism (Sale 1985) animal/earth liberation (Malm 2021), feminist ecology (Salleh 2017), and critical climatology (Chaturvedi and Doyle, 2016) have

all popularized the awareness of ecological politics and environmental political theory. Yet, these developments along with new social movements, like Deep Adaptation, Degrowth, Extinction Rebellion, Fridays for the Future, or Voluntary Simplicity, have not materially slowed the sustainable degradation of the planet by the existing economic and social order. With increasing collective concern about the risks of global warming, climate change, widespread drought, resource shortages, and toxic pollutants in the twentieth century after 1970, Earth's diverse ecologies have become more salient preoccupations for powerful economic and political interests. Yet, this interest is reactionary more than it is transformative, since such vested interests are only eager to ensure the own political resilience as well as the minimum levels of ecological sustainability needed to sustain their domination on a local, national, and global scale (Carson 1962; Meadows et al. 1972; Ophuls 1977; Brown 1981; World Commission on Environment and Development 1987; McDonough 1992; Shellenberger 2020).

Yet, the existing economic and social systems' policy networks and scientific programs still misinterpret the social hazards inflicted upon the environment, and then try to intervene effectively to mitigate them by plying the symptoms with positivistic technocratic methods and biases – rooted in the sciences of resource conservation, range management or resilience planning – instead of calling upon more foundational ecological criticism or radical environmental theory (Commoner 1971; Shellenberger 2020). This systematic neglect of critical political science as well as ecological critique in policy-making circles has been a tragic oversight. The analysis by green critics of the disaster capitalist mode of production behind today's environmental degradation has a much more nuanced understanding of the crises erupting in Nature as well as the public's growing doubts about the self-serving solutions of the corporate managers and technocratic experts still keeping their tenuous control over the world's existing economic and social systems. As the world slides into the hybrid postnatural/technonatural conditions of the Anthropocene (Schwägerl 2014; McNeill and Engelke 2014), it is crucial that fresh perspectives on these developments in critical political science gain greater expo-

sure in public and professional debates about the environment and politics (Nixon 2011; Parenti 2011; Latour 2018; Milanovic 2019). Fortunately, a number of widely recognized journals of critical political and social science, like *Antipode*, *Capitalism Nature Socialism*, *Critical Policy Studies*, *Current Perspectives in Social Theory*, *Monthly Review*, *New Political Science*, or *Philosophy and Social Criticism*, remain open to maintaining robust debates about ecology and environmental theory as integral elements of critical political science.

TIMOTHY W. LUKE

References

- Abu-Lughod, J. 1991. *Before European Hegemony: The World System A.D. 1250–1350*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Barrow, Clyde. 2022. "What is in a Name? From New Political Science to Critical Political Science." *New Political Science* 44, no. 1: 3–26.
- Barrow, Clyde. 2017. "The Political and Intellectual Origins of New Political Science." *New Political Science* 39, no. 4: 437–72.
- Bernstein, Eduard. 1961 [1899]. *Evolutionary Socialism: A Criticism and Affirmation*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Bookchin, Murray. 1971. *Post-scarcity Anarchism*. San Francisco: Ramparts Press.
- Brown, Lester. 1981. *Building a Sustainable Society*. Washington, DC: W. W. Norton.
- Carson, Rachel. 1962. *Silent Spring*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2009. "The Climate of History: Four Theses." *Critical Inquiry* 35, no. 2: 197–222.
- Chaturvedi, S. and T. Doyle. 2016. *Climate Terror: A Critical Geopolitics of Climate Change*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Commoner, Barry. 1971. *The Closing Circle: Man, Nature and Technology*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Devall, Bill, and George Sessions. 1985. *Deep Ecology*. Layton, UT: Peregrine Smith Books.
- Dien, M. I. 1990. *The Environmental Dimensions of Islam*. Cambridge: Lutterwork Press.
- Dowie, M. 1995. *Losing Ground: American Environmentalism at the Close of the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Engels, Friedrich. 1902 [1884]. *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co.
- Foster, John Bellamy. 2002. *Ecology Against Capitalism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Gottlieb, R. 2005. *Forcing the Spring: The Transformation of the American Environmental Movement*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Hobbes, Thomas. 2004 [1651]. *Leviathan*. New York: Barnes & Noble Books.

- Hoffman, R. 2014. *An Environmental History of Medieval Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kassiola, J. J., ed. 2003. *Explorations in Environmental Political Theory: Thinking About What We Value*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Klein, Naomi. 2014. *This Changes Everything: Capitalism vs. The Climate*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Kropotkin, Peter. 1904 [1902]. *Mutual Aid: A Factor in Evolution*. New York: McClure Phillips & Co.
- Latour, Bruno. 2018. *Down to Earth: Politics in the New Climatic Regime*, translated by Catherine Porter. Medford, MA: Polity Press.
- Locke, John. 2015 [1689]. *Second Treatise on Civil Government*. Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press.
- Luke, Timothy. 2019. *Anthropocene Alerts: Critical Theory of the Contemporary as Ecocritique*. Candor, NY: Telos Press Publishing.
- Luke, Timothy. 1999. *Capitalism, Democracy, and Ecology: Departing from Marx*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Luke, Timothy. 1997. *Ecocritique: Contesting the Politics of Nature, Economy and Culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Malm, Andreas. 2021. *How to Blow up a Pipeline: Learning to Fight in a World on Fire*. New York: Verso.
- Marsh, G. P. 1874. *The Earth as Modified by Human Action: A New Edition of Man and Nature*. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co.
- Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. 1969 [1848]. "The Manifesto of the Communist Party." Moore, S. with Friedrich Engels. *Marx/Engels Selected Works*, Vol. One, 98–137. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Macdonald, Bradley. 2017. "Traditional and Critical Theory Today: Toward a Critical Political Science." *New Political Science* 39, no. 4: 511–22.
- McDonough, W. 1992. *The Hannover Principles: Design for Sustainability*. Charlottesville, VA: William McDonough & Partners.
- McNeill, J. R. and P. Engelke. 2014. *The Great Acceleration: An Environmental History of the Anthropocene since 1945*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap/Harvard University Press.
- Meadows, D. et al. 1972. *The Limits to Growth*. New York: Signet.
- Merchant, Carolyn. 2016. *Autonomous Nature: Problems of Prediction and Control from Ancient Times to the Scientific Revolution*. New York: Routledge.
- Merchant, Carolyn. 1980. *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology and the Scientific Revolution*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Mitchell, T. 2011. *Carbon Democracy: Political Power in the Age of Oil*. Brooklyn: Verso.
- Milanovic, B. 2019. *Capitalism Alone: The Future of the System that Rules the World*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Monroe, Kristin. 2005. *Perestroika! The Raucous Rebellion in Political Science*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Nixon, R. 2011. *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Ophuls, William. 1977. *Ecology and the Politics of Scarcity*. New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Parenti, C. 2011. *Tropic of Chaos: Climate Change and the New Geography of Violence*. New York: Nation Books.
- Ricci, David. 1984. *The Tragedy of Political Science: Politics, Scholarship and Democracy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Rousseau, J.-J. 2018 [1755]. *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*. Prague: www.files.ethz.ch/isn/125494/5019_Rousseau_Discourse_on_the-Origin_of_Inequality.pdf.
- Salé, K. 1985. *Dwellers in the Land; The Bioregional Vision*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.
- Salleh, Ariel. 2017. *Ecofeminism as Politics: Nature, Marx and the Postmodern*, new edn. London: Zed Books.
- Schram, Sanford. 2006. *Making Political Science Matter: Debating Knowledge, Research, and Method*. New York: New York University Press.
- Schwägerl, C. 2014. *The Anthropocene: The Human Era and How It Shapes Our Planet*. Santa Fe, NM: Synergetic Press.
- Shellenberger, M. 2020. *Apocalypse Never: Why Environmental Alarmism Hurts Us All*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Soper, K. 1995. *What is Nature? Culture, Politics and the Non-Human*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Wallerstein, I. 2011. *The Modern World System I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- World Commission on Environment and Development. 1987. *Our Common Future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Worster, David. 1994. *Nature's Economy: A History of Ecological Ideas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

See also

Andre Gorz; Indigenous Movements; Timothy W. Luke

35. Intersectionality

Intersectionality is a feminist theory and methodology that originated in Black Feminism. The term *intersectionality* was first used by Kimberlé Crenshaw in her 1989 article, “Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Anti-Discrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory, and Anti-Racist Politics,” where she developed a Black feminist criticism of the single-axis framework in antidiscrimination law. Crenshaw argued that dominant conceptions of discrimination condition people to think along a single categorical axis (i.e., race or gender), thus erasing the discrimination faced by Black women, who experience racial and sex oppression both simultaneously and intersectionally. Specifically, she demonstrated that if companies hired and promoted white women, plaintiffs could not successfully demonstrate sex discrimination, and if companies hired and promoted Black men, they could not successfully demonstrate race discrimination, even if they did not hire or promote Black women, arguing that a *single-axis framework* was not sufficient for demonstrating what amounted to *intersectional discrimination*.

In her book, *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*, Patricia Hill Collins, often recognized as one of the founders of intersectional analysis with Kimberlé Crenshaw (1990, 221–2), discusses the need to see race, class, and gender as interlocking systems of oppression:

Black feminist thought fosters a fundamental paradigmatic shift that rejects additive approaches to oppression. Instead of starting with gender and then adding in other variables such as age, sexual orientation, race, social class, and religion, Black feminist thought sees these distinctive systems of oppression as being part of one overarching structure of domination. Viewing relations of domination for Black women for any given sociohistorical context as being structured via a system of interlocking race, class, and gender oppression expands the focus of analysis from merely describing the similarities and differences distinguishing these systems of oppression and focuses greater attention on how they interconnect. Assuming that each system needs the others in order to function creates a distinct

theoretical stance that stimulates the rethinking of basic social science concepts.

Since then, a wide range of theoretical and empirical work has emerged utilizing intersectional approaches (1) to understand how interlocking systems of oppression based on categories of race, class, sex, gender, sexuality, nation, ethnicity, coloniality, and (dis)ability, among other identities, perpetuate relations of domination and subordination and (2) to work toward their demise. However, it is important first to address the history of African American women speaking intersectionally about their experiences of oppression based on race, sex, gender, sexuality, and class *before* the term itself even existed. Crenshaw coined the term to capture how race and sex, in particular, interconnect to create the multiple oppressions that Black women and women of color had been describing since at least Sojourner Truth gave her famous “Ain’t I a Woman?” speech in Akron, Ohio in 1851. Truth was one of the first women to deconstruct the notion of “womanhood” as “white womanhood”:

Look at my arm! I have ploughed and planted and gathered into barns, and no man could head me – and ain’t I a woman? I could work as much and eat as much as a man – when I could get it – and bear the lash as well! And ain’t I a woman? I have born thirteen children, and seen most of ‘em sold into slavery, and when I cried out with my mother’s grief, none but Jesus heard me – and ain’t I a woman? (hooks 1981, 160)

In her book, *Intersectionality: An Intellectual History*, Ange-Marie Hancock (2016) identified an 1831 article written by Maria Stewart and published in William Garrison’s *Liberator* newspaper as “the earliest known acknowledgement of the simultaneous impacts of racism, sexism, and class-based oppression” (Hancock 2015, 620). Others like Vivian May (2012) and Brittany Cooper (2017) have argued for the inclusion of Anna Julia Cooper’s *A Voice from the South* (1892) as an articulation of intersectionality theory (Nash 2019, 7). From Stewart to Truth to Cooper and beyond, countless examples of “intersectionality-like thinking” were expressed by women of color in the US (Hancock 2016).

In her testimony to the House Committee on Education and Labor in 1970, activist, lawyer, feminist, author, poet, and the first African American Episcopal woman priest Pauli Murray theorized Jane Crow and the relationship between race and sex-based oppressions:

I am both a Negro and a woman whose experience embodies the conjunction of race and sex discrimination ... Moreover, in more than 30 years of intensive study of human rights and deep involvement in the civil rights movement I have observed the interrelationships between what is often referred to as racism and sexism (Jim Crow and Jane Crow) and have been unable to avoid the conclusion that discrimination because of one's sex is just as degrading, dehumanizing, immoral, unjust, indefensible, infuriating, and capable of producing societal turmoil as discrimination because of one's race ... There are those who would have us believe that the struggle against racism is the No. 1 issue of human relations in the United States and must take priority over all other issues. I must respectfully dissent from this view. The struggle against sexism is equally urgent. More than half of all Negroes and other ethnic minorities are women. The costly lesson of our own history in the United States is that when the rights of one group are affirmed and those of another group are ignored, the consequences are tragic (Freedman 2007, 284–5).

Murray here eloquently captures the coterminous nature of identity variables as they continuously reconfigure each other, a dynamism that, in preventing the ossification of hierarchical categories, is central to intersectionality's critical epistemology. In 1977, the Combahee River Collective wrote one of the most powerfully intersectional arguments 12 years before the word was coined. In "A Black Feminist Statement," Barbara Smith, Beverly Smith, and Demita Frazier outlined an analysis of and emancipatory solutions to interlocking and mutually constitutive systems of oppression based on race, class, gender, and sexuality. Echoing Murray's point, they state:

We believe that sexual politics under patriarchy is as pervasive in black women's lives as are the politics of class and race. We also often find it difficult to separate race from class from sex oppression because in our lives they are most often experienced simultaneously. We know that there is such a thing as racial-sexual oppression which is neither solely racial or

solely sexual, e.g., the history of rape of black women by white men as a weapon of political repression ... We realize that the liberation of all oppressed peoples necessitates the destruction of the political-economic systems of capitalism and imperialism as well as patriarchy. We are socialists because we believe the work must be organized for the collective benefit of those who do the work and create the products and not for the profits of the bosses. Material resources must be equally distributed among those who create these resources. We are not convinced, however, that a socialist revolution that is not also a feminist and anti-racist revolution will guarantee our liberation (Guy-Sheftall 1995, 234–5).

This statement is as timely now as it was then. It highlights the structural dimensions of intersectionality as constitutive of systemic global oppressions deployed through capitalism, patriarchy, imperialism, and racism.

What these examples all have in common are their shared focus on the intersection of race- and gender-based oppressions. But they do not stop there, as the Combahee River Collective clearly demonstrates with their focus on the intersection of class and sexual oppressions as well. While centering the experience of African American women, Patricia Hill Collins (1990) also saw the importance of bringing multiple interlocking systems of oppression, such as age, sexual orientation, religion, and ethnicity, into one's analysis:

Replacing additive models of oppression with interlocking ones creates possibilities for new paradigms. The significance of seeing race, class, and gender as interlocking systems of oppression is that such an approach fosters a paradigmatic shift of thinking inclusively about other oppressions, such as age, sexual orientation, religion, and ethnicity. Race, class, and gender represent the three systems of oppression that most heavily affect African-American women. But these systems and the economic, political, and ideological conditions that support them may not be the most fundamental oppressions, and they certainly affect many more groups than Black women. Other people of color, Jews, the poor white women, and gays and lesbians have all had similar ideological justifications offered for their subordination. All categories of humans labeled Others have been equated to one another, to animals, and to nature (224).

In her 1995 article on intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color, Crenshaw described her use of the term as primarily focusing on the intersection between race and gender, but also stated that she welcomed others to expand that methodology to include multiple identity categories:

I consider intersectionality a provisional concept linking contemporary politics with postmodern theory. In mapping the intersections of race and gender, the concept does engage dominant assumptions that race and gender are essentially separate categories. By tracing the categories to their intersections, I hope to suggest a methodology that will ultimately disrupt the tendencies to see race and gender as exclusive or separable. While the primary intersections that I explore here are between race and gender, the concept can and should be expanded by factoring in issues such as class, sexual orientation, age and color (378).

In her 2007 *Perspectives on Politics* article, political scientist Ange-Marie Hancock describes intersectionality as both an empirical and a normative research paradigm that has and will make contributions to several critical interdisciplinary fields outside of feminist theory:

The term “intersectionality” refers to *both* a normative theoretical argument *and* an approach to conducting empirical research that emphasizes the interaction of categories of difference (included but not limited to race, gender, class, and sexual orientation) [emphasis in the original] ... Within political science, while the embrace of intersectionality has received its widest acceptance in feminist theory, intersectional research has pushed the boundaries in critical legal studies, social movements, public policy, international human rights, and racial/ethnic politics, though it should by no means be limited to these areas of research (63).

Thus, intersectionality is both a diagnostic tool to describe the multiple subject positions of women and men traveling within systems of oppression around the world *and* a prescriptive way of envisioning the kind of world women activists, feminist agents, and social justice advocates work to bring into being. In other words, “intersectionality” signals a commitment to critical political science and the struggle to make the world a better place by its very definition.

In her 2008 book, *Women’s Activism and Feminist Agency in Mozambique and Nicaragua*, Jennifer Leigh Disney argued that “using intersectionality as a theory and a method of study not only produces the most inclusive way to approach, analyse, and understand comparative feminisms, but also provides a normative framework for the creation of an anti-oppression politics” (17). In that book, Disney argued that she wanted to “attempt to construct an integrated vision of comparative feminisms based on the adoption of a standpoint of intersectionality, using intersectionality as both a methodological approach for conducting cross-cultural research and a normative theory for envisioning an emancipatory, feminist, anti-oppression politics” (2008, 21). Moreover, Disney made an argument for adopting a standpoint of intersectionality “specifically from the perspective of poor women of color in the Third World, who experience every day the intersectionality of racism, sexism, and classism on a global scale” because “[t]he voices and experiences of women in the developing world can best help us understand the intersectionality of race, gender, class, national, colonial, and imperialist-based oppressions *precisely because* of their location at these intersections” (2008, 43). Disney stated directly that her choice of empirical comparison revealed her “methodological and theoretical bias toward intersectionality as a necessary deconstructive corrective to Western feminisms and as a constructive tool to build more inclusive, democratic, antiracist, and anticapitalist feminisms” (2008, 44).

Can intersectionality travel?

The application of intersectionality outside of its origins in the experiences of African American women and the theories of Black Feminists have raised concerns about the extent to which intersectionality can *travel*. In her 2012 article, “Disappearing Acts: Reclaiming Intersectionality in the Social Sciences in a Post-Black Feminist Era,” Nikol Alexander-Floyd expresses concern that “post-black feminist definitions of intersectionality in the social sciences have ‘disappeared’ black women as knowledge producers and subjects of investigation” (1). Alexander-Floyd conducts a detailed analysis of the rhetorical strategies adopted in the work

of Leslie McCall (2005) and Ange-Marie Hancock (2007). Then, she describes what she thinks needs to happen in order to “maintain the integrity of intersectionality as it is integrated into the social sciences”: (1) focusing on illuminating women of color as political and intersectional subjects; (2) centering the voices of Black women and other women of color in our research and classrooms; and (3) taking seriously the epistemological challenges of women of color, particularly in terms of using narrative as the basis of interpretive and qualitative methodologies (2012, 19). These are important cautionary points, and they need to be taken seriously by scholars, particularly scholars who are not women of color, and those who deploy an intersectional approach to the study of groups and actors other than women of color.

Some women of color are more comfortable with the ways that an intersectional standpoint theory has been put into motion. In her 2019 book, *Black Feminism Reimagined After Intersectionality*, Jennifer C. Nash expresses concern that contemporary academic Black feminism has become marked by the single affect of *defensiveness* (3). She argues that Black feminist defensiveness is “manifested most explicitly through black feminism’s proprietary attachments to intersectionality,” leading Black feminists into a “largely protective posture” in the role of “policing intersectionality’s usages, demanding that intersectionality remain located within black feminism, and reasserting intersectionality’s ‘true’ origins in black feminist texts” (3). Nash states that her wish is for “a black feminist theory that refuses to participate in the intersectionality wars, and that insists that women’s studies move away from its insistent use of black women as the field’s key sign” (138).

In the December 2015 Special Issue of *New Political Science: A Journal of Politics & Culture*, “Intersectionality in the Global Age,” Jocelyn Boryczka and Jennifer Leigh Disney edited a symposium on Ange-Marie Hancock’s then forthcoming book, *Intersectionality: An Intellectual History*. In that symposium, Nira Yuval-Davis (2015) argues that she, “like Ange-Marie and many other intersectionality scholars, [sees] intersectionality as an analytical approach to understanding mutually constitutive (rather than additive) categorical relationships” (637). However, Yuval-Davis goes on to say

that “politically, I would argue that confining intersectionality only to address issues relating to Black women/women of colours ... runs the risk of pre-assuming a uni-dimensionality of social and political marginality, invisibility, and oppression – the ‘Oppression Olympics’ construction that Ange-Marie (following Patricia Hill-Collins and others) has rightly rejected” (Yuval-Davis 2015, 637–8). Yuval-Davis continues by highlighting what she thinks makes her approach to intersectionality distinct from Hancock’s, and, arguably, more able to travel:

Fundamental to my approach is that intersectionality analysis should be applied to all people and not just to marginalized and racialized women, with whom the rise of Intersectionality theory is historically linked. My contention is that while the political, professional and disciplinarian interests of those who use Intersectionality analysis might vary, only such a generic approach to Intersectionality analysis could ultimately avoid the risk of exceptionalism and of reifying and essentializing social boundaries. As critical race and ethnicity studies point out, not only Black people are racially constructed, and feminists remind us that men too have a gender. In my own work I have focused, among others, on racialized indigenous people (especially Palestinians), ethnic minorities, as well as legal and clandestine migrants in the UK and other European countries. However, I have also always argued that in order to analyse discrimination and oppression, our analytical intersectional gaze has to be directed also towards the powerful and not just the powerless. For this reason, I have argued that situated intersectionality has to be seen as the most valid sociological stratification theory, as it is the most comprehensive, complex and nuanced and does not reduce social hierarchical relations into one axis of power, be it class, race or gender (2015, 638).

Similarly, S. Laurel Weldon (2008) argues in her chapter, “Intersectionality” in Gary Goertz and Amy G. Mazur’s edited volume, *Politics, Gender, and Concepts: Theory and Methodology*, that intersectionality as a concept is “especially valuable for those scholars (such as critical theorists) who aim to critically evaluate social relations, exposing relations of domination, or ‘speaking truth to power’” (193). Weldon distinguishes between “intersectionality-only” arguments in the literature, which argue that gender, race, and class, among other variables, have

no autonomous effects, but only intersectional effects, and “intersectionality-plus” arguments, which identify that gender, race, and class, among other variables, can have autonomous effects *and* intersectional effects. The intersectionality-plus approach is “*particularly useful for comparative political analysis, and it makes comparative political analysis critical to understanding gender (and race, and class) politics*” (208, emphasis in original). In other words, the “intersectionality-plus” model travels better. The “intersectionality-plus” model has practical implications for solidarity organizing and building coalitions across intersections that can help determine the best tactics and strategies in a given moment of progressive organizing. For example, while intersectional alertness is always necessary, it is sometimes prudent to support an effort for one identity at a time, or not thwart an effort that may not seem intersectional enough.

Intersectionality as a traveling standpoint

Some scholars argue that intersectionality can be used as both an empirical method for and a normative theory of the study of comparative feminisms as a variant of standpoint theory. While standpoint theory, as indicated by its very name, seems to “stand still,” intersectionality seems able to travel. Yet, we also know standpoint theory has traveled across different iterations of its deployment, and some scholars express concern about intersectionality’s ability to travel.

One of the founders of feminist standpoint theory, Nancy Hartsock, tells us that when material reality structures groups in fundamentally opposing ways, “the vision of each will represent an inversion of the other, and in systems of domination the vision available to the rulers will be both partial and perverse” (1985, 232). If the vision of the oppressor is partial, is not the vision of the oppressed also partial? Or is the vision of the oppressed somehow universal?

In the twentieth century, many scholars developed standpoint theory as a way to represent the perspective of oppressed people. Georg Lukacs (1971), drawing on and modifying Hegel and Marx, argued for a kind of “class standpoint” by asserting that the proletariat, being the identical subject-object of history, is able to see reality in its totality,

and is therefore the class most capable of historical universal liberatory transformation. Charles Mills discusses standpoint theory in *The Racial Contract*: “The term ‘standpoint theory’ is now routinely used to signify the notion that in understanding the workings of a system of oppression, a perspective from the bottom up is more likely to be accurate than one from the top down” (1997, 109–10). Mills states that he is arguing for a kind of “racial” version of standpoint theory that resonates with the notion of “double consciousness” of W.E.B. DuBois. Similarly, in her 1987 book, *Borderlands/La Frontera*, Gloria Anzaldúa describes how the new *mestiza consciousness* that emerges from living at the intersection of multiple cultures operates to better analyse contradictions and offer emancipatory solutions:

Cradled in one culture, sandwiched between two cultures, straddling all three cultures and their value systems, *la mestiza* goes through a struggle of flesh, a struggle of borders, an inner war ... The new mestiza copes by developing a tolerance for contradictions, a tolerance for ambiguity. She learns to be an Indian in Mexican culture, to be Mexican from an Anglo point of view. She learns to juggle cultures. She has a plural personality, she operates in a pluralistic mode—nothing is thrust out, the good, the bad, and the ugly, nothing is rejected, nothing abandoned. Not only does she sustain contradictions, she turns the ambivalence into something else ... *En unas pocas centurias*, the future will belong to the mestiza. Because the future depends on the breaking down of paradigms, it depends on the straddling of two or more cultures. By creating a new mythos—that is, a change in the way we perceive reality, the way we see ourselves, and the ways we behave, the *mestiza* creates a new consciousness. The work of *mestiza consciousness* is to break down the subject-object duality that keeps her a prisoner, and to show in the flesh and through the images in her work how duality is transcended (99–101).

Nancy Hartsock describes a general standpoint of the oppressed: “As an engaged vision, the understanding of the oppressed, the adoption of a standpoint exposes the real relations among human beings as inhuman, points beyond the present, and carries a historically liberatory role” (1985, 232).

Patricia Hill Collins (1990) saw standpoint theory from a traveling intersectional

perspective through the lens of a matrix of domination:

Embracing a both/and conceptual stance moves us from additive, separate systems approaches to oppression and toward what I now see as the more fundamental issue of the social relations of domination. Race, class, and gender constitute axes of oppression that characterize Black women's experiences within a more generalized matrix of domination. Other groups may encounter different dimensions of the matrix, such as sexual orientation, religion, and age, but the overarching relationship is one of domination and the types of activism it generates (226).

This analysis of relations of domination and subordination is very similar to the approach to feminism adopted by bell hooks (1981):

To me, feminism is not simply a struggle to end male chauvinism or a movement to ensure that women will have equal rights with men; it is a commitment to eradicating the ideology of domination that permeates Western culture on various levels – sex, race, and class, to name a few – and a commitment to reorganizing [U.S.] society so that the self-development of people can take precedence over imperialism, economic expansion, and material desires (194–5).

A critical political science recognizes that the best way to understand the relationship between global systems of racial, sexual, and class domination, among other systems of oppression, is to theorize and conduct research from a standpoint of intersectionality. A commitment to adopting a standpoint of intersectionality requires researchers to examine two or more variables at a time, avoiding a single-axis framework as Crenshaw describes. Such a commitment is important both because it renders a more accurate description of the social-political world, but also because it critically intervenes in scholarly habits and political practices that exclude oppressed and marginalized groups. As Kimberlé Crenshaw notes, “intersectionality is not being offered as some new, totalizing theory of identity” (1995, 358). Rather, adopting a standpoint of intersectionality affords scholars and researchers the opportunity to adopt *many* different standpoints in attempting to theorize, analyse, and understand the inner workings of systems of

oppression and how relationships of domination and subordination operate. Adopting a standpoint of intersectionality will illuminate more theoretically and empirically than adopting a single-axis framework from the perspective of any one standpoint. Intersectionality helps us recognize, research, and study empirically how these systems of oppression intersect in our lives, helps shape our lived experiences, *and* normatively works toward their demise.

JENNIFER LEIGH DISNEY

References

- Alexander-Floyd, Nikol. 2012. “Disappearing Acts: Reclaiming Intersectionality in the Social Sciences in a Post-Black Feminist Era.” *Feminist Formations* 24, no.1 (Spring): 1–25.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 1990. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Cooper, Brittany. 2017. *Beyond Respectability: The Intellectual Thought of Race Women*. Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 1989. “Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Anti-Discrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory, and Anti-Racist Politics.” *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 139–67.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 1995. “Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color.” In *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings That Formed the Movement*, edited by Kimberlé Crenshaw, Neil Gotanda, Gary Peller, and Kendall Thomas, 357–83. New York: The Free Press.
- Disney, Jennifer Leigh. 2008. *Women's Activism and Feminist Agency in Mozambique and Nicaragua*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Freedman, Estelle B. 2007. *The Essential Feminist Reader*. New York: The Modern Library.
- Guy-Sheftall, Beverly. 1995. *Words of Fire: An Anthology of African American Feminist Thought*. New York: The New Press.
- Hancock, Ange-Marie. 2007. “When Multiplication Doesn't Equal Quick Addition: Examining Intersectionality as a Research Paradigm.” *Perspectives on Politics* 5, no. 1 (March): 63–79.
- Hancock, Ange-Marie. 2007. “Intersectionality as a Normative and Empirical Paradigm.” *Politics & Gender* 3 no. 2, 248–54.
- Hancock, Ange-Marie. 2011. *Solidarity Politics for Millenials: A Guide to Ending the Oppression Olympics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hancock, Ange-Marie. 2015. “Intersectionality's

- Will Toward Social Transformation. Book Symposium on *Intersectionality: An Intellectual History*." *New Political Science* 37, no. 4: 620–27.
- Hancock, Ange-Marie. 2016. *Intersectionality: An Intellectual History*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hartsock, Nancy. 1985. *Money, Sex, and Power: Toward a Feminist Historical Materialism*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- hooks, bell. 1981. *Ain't I a Woman? Black Women and Feminism*. Boston: South End Press.
- Lukacs, Georg. 1971. *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*, translated by Rodney Livingstone. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.
- May, Vivian. 2012. "Intellectual Genealogies, Intersectionality, and Anna Julia Cooper." In *Feminist Solidarity at the Crossroads: Intersectional Women's Studies for Transracial Alliance*, edited by Kim Marie Vaz and Gary L. Lemons, 57–71. New York: Routledge.
- McCall, Leslie. 2005. "The Complexity of Intersectionality." *Signs* 30, no. 3: 1771–800.
- Mills, Charles. 1997. *The Racial Contract*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Moraga, Cherrie and Gloria Anzaldúa. 1981. *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings By Radical Women of Color*. Watertown, MA: Persephone Press.
- Nash, Jennifer C. 2019. *Black Feminism Reimagined After Intersectionality*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Smith, Barbara. 1998. *The Truth That Never Hurts: Writings on Race, Gender, and Freedom*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Weldon, S. Laurel. 2008. "Intersectionality." In *Politics Gender and Concepts: Theory and Methodology*, edited by Gary Goertz and Amy G. Mazur, 193–218. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira. 2015. "Situating Intersectionality: A Contribution to the Symposium on Ange-Marie Hancock's Forthcoming Book: Intersectionality – An Intellectual History." *New Political Science* 37, no. 4, 637–42.
- Mohanty, Chandra. 2004. *Feminism Without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Rich, Adrienne. 1994. "Notes Toward a Politics of Location." In *Blood, Bread, and Poetry: Selected Prose 1979–1985*. New York: W.W. Norton and Co., Inc.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira. 2011. "Beyond the Recognition and Re-distribution Dichotomy: Intersectionality and Stratification." In *Framing Intersectionality: Debates on a Multi-Faceted Concept in Gender Studies*, edited by Helma Lutz, M.T. Herera and L. Supik, 155–70. Farnham, UK: Ashgate.

Further readings

See also

Critical Latino Politics, Critical Race Theory, Feminist Critiques of Political Science, Global Studies as Critical Political Science, LGBTQ Critiques of Political Science, Marxism, Feminism and the State

36. Social movements analysis

Scholars devote significant attention to the study of mass movements, with an emphasis on how their rapid mainstreaming in modern times has led to the creation of a “social movement society” (Tarrow 2021). Scholars seek to develop “meta” narratives that characterize these movements and explain under what conditions they are more or less likely to succeed. These efforts are not new; they span back decades via countless academic studies. In *Understanding Social Movements*, Steven Buechler (2016, 96–7) summarizes the competing models for understanding these movements. “Strain and deprivation” models emphasize how people are motivated to form movements via the threats of “downward mobility” in a materialistic or status sense, and “status inconsistency” between what people want or need and what they have that “may compel people into collective action to improve their lower status” via the formation of social movements. It is this “development of discontent” that propels movements forward (Buechler 2016, 97).

In contrast to the strain-deprivation model, the “resource mobilization” model says that grievance or strain are “seriously inadequate” and unlikely to motivate people to action, since most people who are unhappy with their lot in life quietly endure these feelings without organizing or protesting. The resource mobilization model envisions “entrepreneurial leaders and resource availability” as “a more critical determinant” of whether movements emerge and grow than grievance or strain (Buechler 2017, 113–18). Building and elaborating on resource mobilization, the “political process” model claims that movements’ emergence is a function of numerous factors, including: (1) The extent to which “the structure of political opportunities” is sympathetic to a movement via government openness to its demands; (2) the ability of a movement and its organizations to mobilize and cultivate resources to sustain its actions; and (3) the extent to which individuals develop “cognitive liberation” in challenging a status quo that works against their interests. Included in the third point is movement grievances, which motivate social movement actors to protest established socio-cultural, eco-

nomic, and political structures. Additionally, Buechler explains, the ways that movements engage in “framing” their grievances matters, as they seek to “socially construct” narratives that are sympathetic to movement ideology and demands. Finally, recent approaches to studying social movements recognize them as a product of cultural and group identities, which are crucial to defining and motivating movement actors (Buechler 2017, 134–63).

There is much to appreciate in each of these model’s contributions to understanding how social movements emerge and why they succeed or fail. Clearly, individuals within social movements have grievances and reasons they are unhappy that motivate them. And resources matter to sustaining any organization, including those that comprise social movements. Additionally, whether movements benefit from government support is important to achieving political change, while the ways in which participants view movements – as liberating them from the status quo – and the way they frame their demands to the public, are important to understanding social movements. Finally, identity also matters, since movements are comprised of supporters, and those supporters’ identities drive how they see the world and interact in it.

Previous scholarship gives ample reason to recognize the multiple dimensions at work that account for why movements form. Some scholars emphasize the significance of government and the opportunity structures they provide (Tarrow 2021; Milkis and Tichenor 2019; Schlozman 2015). Other work identifies the centrality of government resources in the case of right-wing political movements – which rely on support from the Republican Party – and in the case of the Tea Party and Trumpism, suffer from anemic organizing efforts that make them difficult to sustain without party support (DiMaggio 2020, 2022). Some scholarship emphasizes the value of social networking and social media as a resource itself in fueling movement organizing, while recognizing that emotions and the identities that drive them are vital to movement success (Castells 2015; Jasper 2019; Kennis 2022). Finally, a mountain of scholarship describes various forms of identity and how they motivate movement activism, including identities based on environmentalism and environmental justice (Hadden 2015; Staggenborg 2020; Roseworn 2014;

Stegr et al. 2013), race (Taylor 2016; Gillion 2020; Woodly 2022), gender (Giesler 2019; Neger 2021; Fisher 2019; Durham 2021), sexual orientation (Garretson 2018; Stulberg 2018; Hindman 2019), poverty and economic insecurity (Barrett 2018; della Porta 2015; Gould-Wartofsky 2015; DiMaggio 2020), and reactionary and fascistic identities (Stern 2019; Parker and Bareto 2013; DiMaggio 2022; DiBranco and Ebin 2022). And some works emphasize how the intersections of these identities are central to understanding what drives modern movements (Weldon 2015; DiMaggio 2020; Jackson et al. 2020).

Recognizing that the competing models explored thus far each have something important to say, one can also draw larger conclusions about which ones – relative to the others – are more useful in accounting for how social movements work. Some scholars seek to situate social movements as working in partnership with government structures, political parties, and officials to achieve their goals – thereby suggesting that political opportunity structures are central to movement success or failure. My research emphasizes the centrality of grievances and anger from those opposed to the status quo – coupled with the power of identity – as of prime importance in understanding social movements. I find that social movements, far more than organized political parties, are central to promoting democratic transformation and change in U.S. society and politics. I emphasize how social movements operate within environments to pursue their interests. Marx (1890) wrote that “men make their own history, but they do not make it as they please; they do not make it under self-selected circumstances, but under circumstances existing already, given and transmitted from the past.” Recognizing this point, progressive movements are not simply manifestations of “free will,” but of constrained will, in which activists respond to power asymmetries in society, seeking to reduce inequality and promote a new, more equitable status quo. Drawing on Gramsci and hegemony theory, I argue that these movements challenge the status quo, in the process undermining “common sense” assumptions that dominate mainstream politics and that benefit affluent political, economic, and social actors – particularly members of the upper class and the owners of business and industry – the bourgeoisie. Successful movements see their

demands – at least those that are compatible with capitalism – co-opted into a new status quo, via political reforms that rely on their “consent,” while granting them concessions.

There is reason to privilege some models for understanding how social movements work, while de-emphasizing others. In terms of de-emphasis, resource mobilization theory is suspect as a primary explanation for the success of progressive social movements. Most of these movements, because they seek to undermine the status quo, directly challenge the power of political, social, and economic elites. Which means that they benefit from few resources – especially initially – in terms of potential government support and support from wealthy benefactors. They often toil for years, relying on their strength in numbers, before they begin to break into mainstream political discourse, shift public opinion, and alter public policy debates and policy itself. Furthermore, the “political process” model also fails to recognize that grievances from disadvantaged and repressed groups are the primary driver of mass movements.

In researching progressive movements, I highlight the dominant pathway through which these activists seek to alter the status quo. Drawing on modern case studies, I agree with fellow social scientists that the U.S. has become a “social movement society” – with movements being rapidly mainstreamed over the last decade from the 2010s onward. Incorporating various case studies – including the 2011 Wisconsin labor protests, Occupy Wall Street, Black Lives Matter (BLM), MeToo, the Fight for \$15, and the anti-Trump movement – I document how grassroots progressive movements draw on the identities of participants across class, race, and color lines (and at their intersections) to alter American politics. They proceed through various stages in transforming politics and society, including: (1) The persistence of grievances, which serve as a motivation for activists to form a movement; (2) a specific catalyst event that sets a movement into action and helps individuals to overcome apathy and a sense of helplessness; (3) mass mobilization and community outreach; (4) the winning of sympathetic coverage from the news media in favor of a movement’s demands; (5) the cultivation of mass support – particularly among those paying attention to the movement in the news; and (6) pressure for electoral and polit-

ical change that favors the movement and its political demands.

Contrary to advocates of resource mobilization theory, the case studies above are important in showing that disillusioned Americans who were previously demobilized can overcome their passivity through catalyst events. Americans who are angry about police brutality were impelled to action in waves of protest via the BLM movement following traumatic acts of violence – including the deaths of individuals like Michael Brown, Eric Garner, Philando Castille, Freddie Gray, Laquan McDonald, and George Floyd, among many others at the hands of police. Labor activists in Wisconsin were mobilized to action by the threat of a rightwing Republican governor who sought to dismantle basic protections for labor unions, including collective bargaining and various financial workplace benefits for union employees. Occupy Wall Street emerged in the wake of the 2008–09 economic collapse, with Americans participating in the movement expressing concerns with rising inequality, corporate greed, rising unemployment, spiraling costs for health care and higher education, intensifying economic insecurity, and outrage at government bailouts of Wall Street. Fight for \$15 activists were operating in the post-economic crash economy of the 2010s, which was characterized by rising worker insecurity, declining value of the minimum wage, record inequality, and a lack of union protections for private sector workers. Finally, MeToo and anti-Trump activists responded to the elevation of a deeply reactionary president to the highest political office in the nation, in large part because they opposed his militant sexism – which included boasting about sexually assaulting women. The MeToo movement mobilized women who had long been angry about the epidemic of sexism and sexual discrimination, harassment, and violence that targets women in professional work environments and beyond. This explosion of women's rights activism would likely not have happened if it had not been for the rise of Trumpism and his normalization of sexism.

As I document in my book *Rebellion in America*, each of these movements used the news media – some more successfully than others – to draw public attention to their messages. For the 2011 Wisconsin labor protests, news reporting regularly emphasized

union activists' anger at the governor's attack on collective bargaining and the impending assault on their pensions and health insurance benefits. With Occupy Wall Street, news reports routinely highlighted the movement's concerns with Wall Street and corporate greed, activists' economic anxiety about the modern economy, and concerns with a class conflict in which government is mobilized to privilege corporate power over the interests of the people. For BLM, reporting became increasingly sympathetic to the movement throughout the mid to late 2010s, emphasizing activists' anger about police brutality and racial profiling, racial injustice in America, and the generally peaceful orientation of most-all BLM activists via multiple waves of protest. With MeToo, reporting regularly directed attention to movement outrage over the epidemic of sexism, including concerns with sexual predators and violence, sexual abuse and assault, and sexual harassment in the workplace and beyond.

These movements all succeeded in building momentum for political change. First, they cultivated growing mass support for their political positions and demands, particularly among those who reported in national surveys paying increased attention to news reporting on these movements and their concerns. Second, they initiated national conversations that not only impacted how people look at electoral candidates, but put pressure on the Democratic Party and other political officials to seek reforms benefitting the movements. The Wisconsin labor protests and Occupy Wall Street initiated a national discussion about worker insecurity and rising inequality that continued into the 2020s, and set the stage for Fight for \$15's rise. With Fight for \$15, the Democratic Party officially adopted a \$15 hourly wage as part of its political platform. With BLM, Democratic officials in the federal government were pressured to introduce Department of Justice investigations into cities that were the focus of BLM protests following police killings, including Chicago, Ferguson, and Baltimore, which resulted in intensifying pressures on these police departments to pursue criminal justice reforms. MeToo impacted how employers respond to sexual harassment charges, while impacting how men and women interact in the workplace, and influencing the sorts of candidates Americans were willing to vote

for by discouraging support for those accused of sexual harassment.

Importantly, *Rebellion in America* documents that social movements – not the Democratic Party – are the main impetus in working for political transformation. More specifically, public identification with various movements – including the Wisconsin labor protests, Occupy Wall Street, and BLM – is a much stronger statistical predictor of support for all types of progressive demands for democratic transformation associated with each movement, when compared to public identification with the Democratic Party. Put another way, the Democratic Party is *not* the essential political actor that impels the mass public to alter its priorities in favor of movement demands. Rather, the party reacts to mass pressure that is cultivated by social movements that struggle – sometimes for years – to break through into mainstream political discourse, due to the longstanding and well-documented bias on the part of news reporters in favor of official sources and perspectives.

In this short entry, I have reviewed the competing approaches to how social scientists study social movements. I summarized evidence suggesting that social movements are the primary political actor in working for progressive democratic change. Unfortunately, political scientists, and to a lesser extent sociologists, often fail to devote significant or sustained attention to social movements. Political scientists have been overwhelmingly conformist in emphasizing elections (dominated by the major political parties) as the primary venue for promoting democracy, while devoting virtually no attention in mainstream academic journals to social movements. Such conformist privileging of “the system,” coupled with a neglect of social movements, will need to change if the U.S. intellectual community is to recognize the primary way that progressive democratic reform happens through social movements. Until the centrality of these movements to the political process is recognized, social movements will remain marginalized despite their broad impact on American politics and democracy.

ANTHONY R. DiMAGGIO

References

- Barrett, Dawson. 2018. *The Defiant: Protest Movements in Post-Liberal America*. New York: New York University Press.
- Buechler, Steven M. 2016. *Understanding Social Movements: Theories from the Classical Era to the Present*. London: Routledge.
- Carian, Emily K., Alex DiBranco, and Chelsea Ebin, eds. 2022. *Male Supremacism in the United States: From Patriarchal Traditionalism to Misogynist Incels and the Alt-Right*. London: Routledge.
- Castells, Manuel. 2015. *Networks of Outrage and Hope*. Cambridge: Polity.
- della Porta, Donatella. 2015. *Social Movements in Times of Austerity*. Cambridge: Polity.
- DiMaggio, Anthony. 2020. *Rebellion in America: Citizen Uprisings, the News Media, and the Politics of Plutocracy*. London: Routledge.
- DiMaggio, Anthony. 2022. *Rising Fascism in America: It Can Happen Here*. London: Routledge.
- Durham, Meenakshi Gigi. 2021. *MeToo: The Impact of Rape Culture in the Media*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Fisher, Dana R. 2019. *American Resistance: From the Women's March to the Blue Wave*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Garretson, Jeremiah J. 2018. *The Path to Gay Rights: How Activism and Coming Out Changed Public Opinion*. New York: New York University Press.
- Giesler, Carly. 2019. *The Voices of #MeToo: From Grassroots Activism to a Viral Roar*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Gillion, Daniel Q. 2020. *The Loud Minority: Why Protests Matter in American Democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gould-Wartofsky, Michael A. 2015. *The Occupiers: The Making of the 99 Percent Movement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hadden, Jennifer. 2015. *Networks in Contention: The Divisive Politics of Climate Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hindman, Matthew Dean. 2019. *Political Advocacy and its Interested Citizens: Neoliberalism, Postpluralism, and LGBT Organizations*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Jackson, Sarah J., Moya Bailey, and Brooke Foucault Welles. 2020. *#Hashtag Activism: Networks of Race and Gender Justice*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Jasper, James M. 2019. *The Emotions of Protest*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kennis, Andrew. 2022. *Digital-Age Resistance: Journalism, Social Movements, and the Media Dependence Model*. London: Routledge.
- Marx, Karl. 1890. “The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte.” *Marx/Engels Internet Archive*, October 27, available at www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1890/letters/90_09_27.htm.
- Milkis, Sidney M. and Daniel J. Tichenor.

2019. *Rivalry and Reform: Presidents, Social Movements, and the Transformation of American Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Neger, Jo. 2021. *Gender and Social Movements*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Parker, Christopher S. and Matt A. Barreto. 2013. *Change They Can't Believe in: The Tea Party and Reactionary Politics in America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Roseworn, Stuart, James Goodman, and Rebecca Pearse. 2014. *Climate Action Upsurge: The Ethnography of Climate Movement Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Schlozman, Daniel. 2015. *When Movements Anchor Parties: Electoral Alignments in American History*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Staggenborg, Suzanne. 2020. *Grassroots Environmentalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Steger, Manfred, James Goodman, and Erin K. Wilson. 2013. *Justice Globalism: Ideology, Crisis, Policy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stern, Alexandra Minna. 2019. *Proud Boys and the White Ethnostate: How the Alt-Right is Warping the American Imagination*. New York: Beacon Press.
- Stulberg, Lisa M. 2018. *LGBTQ Social Movements*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Tarrow, Sidney. 2021. *Movements and Parties: Critical Connections in American Political Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, Keeanga-Yamahtta. 2016. *From #Blacklivesmatter to Black Liberation*. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books.
- Weldon, S. Laurel. 2015. *When Protest Makes Policy: How Social Movements Represent Disadvantaged Groups*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Woodly, Deva R. 2022. *Reckoning: Black Lives Matter and the Democratic Necessity of Social Movements*. London: Oxford University Press.

See also

Indigenous Movements; Autoethnography; Intersectionality; Democracy; Direct Action

37. Autoethnography

What follows is written in a conversational style. That's appropriate because what I have to say is so personal – it is grounded in my own personal biography, comes from the heart and it needs to be expressed in a way reflective of the intimate feelings that motivate it. That kind of expression is what is so poignant about this entry's topic: "autoethnography," that is, that form of analysis that draws on personal experience (Ellis and Bochner 2000). In an act of verisimilitude, I will reference my own personal experience to explain the importance of autoethnography. Yet, I also draw on others to help make my point. In the process, I hope to show how autoethnography can further the goal of achieving a better Critical Political Science.

I start with others who offer important insights on this topic. In *Halfway Home*, Reuben Miller (2021) writes:

James Baldwin says one writes only from experience. Nina Simone tells us that it is the artist's obligation to address the times in which she lives. It seems to me that sitting with history, allowing myself to be moved by it, and finding myself within it is the only way to capture what it means to be alive. To write this book in a way that is faithful to my own life and the lives of the men and women I followed and to the sacrifices of my family, especially my grandmother who gave me so much, I have taken James and Nina as muses. I write from my experience as a scholar, as an advocate, and as a man with loved ones who have spent time in prison. I was born poor and black after 1972, the year that mass incarceration began in earnest. Incarceration is a subject that I cannot shake. It haunts me like it haunts the men and women whom I've followed. I simply could not write this as some detached observer because I am close to this book, and I am close to the people in it. Being close allows me to see things the detached observers miss and move in spaces where the policy makers rarely care to look. I've found no easy answers; a five-point plan for policy reform can't save us from the society we've made. But I have found people making lives for themselves in the wake of a conviction. We must understand their lives if we hope to bring about meaningful change. It is from this vantage point that I tell the stories of the people that I've encountered, and it is from this vantage that I interpret what I found. (18–19)

Miller writes eloquently about his family, friends, and others as to their experiences with the criminal justice system, and especially what he calls the "afterlife of mass incarceration." He uses what he calls the "gift of proximity" to make come alive their and his first-hand experiences with the injustice of that system and especially the collateral damage it causes to them and their loved ones to carry on everyday what seems like forever. This gift of proximity is hard earned, if not always actually wanted. Yet, it is undeniable and once given it can be used to produce intimate portraits of lives struggling to survive under the weight of the oxymoron of our unjust criminal justice system.

This is but the latest report from the field that we can use to make Political Science, and even Critical Political Science, both more insightful and more politically effective. Years ago, Nancy Naples (2003) wrote tellingly of "everyday world policy analysis." That was a critical counter approach to mainstream policy analysis, which Naples saw as misguided because it was too top-down, objectivistic, and wrong in claiming that its view from nowhere provided a more scientific understanding of public policy. As a proponent of "feminist" research methods, Naples recognized that the mainstream, orthodox approach to public policy analysis was vulnerable to criticism because it too easily rationalized the importation of the standpoint of policymakers and program managers at the expense of the citizenry whose views were too often neglected first in the making of the policy and then its evaluation (including that done by political scientists). This too often meant adopting the views of males in positions of power while ignoring the views of women who were not in power. This was most especially the case when it came to social welfare policies. Naples believed that a better approach to policy analysis was offered not by pretending we could take an unbiased vantage point from nowhere but by embracing our solidarity with those most affected by public policy and look at things from the bottom up to reveal how ordinary citizens experienced the effects of the policies directed at them (also see Shdaimah, Stahl and Schram 2011; and Schram 1995).

This discussion has relevance to the goal of achieving a genuinely Critical Political Science. For instance, from its inception in the late 1960s, the Caucus for a New Political

Science has been dedicated to making the American Political Science Association (APSA) an organization that promotes a politically relevant Political Science which could help inform the struggles of ordinary people in their quest for a more just political system. Now, you would think that would be uncontroversial: Political Science ought to serve the improvement of politics. Yet, it turns out it is in fact quite controversial (see Schram 2005). The debate has gone on for years and the pushback by the leaders of the Association has always been that as a professional association the APSA's primary goals should be about advancing the scholarly discipline of Political Science and not improving politics. The Association assiduously avoids taking political stances. While that might be understandable given the diversity of political persuasions held by its multitudinous membership, the whole goal of improving politics has gotten sidelined for years. Occasionally, task forces will report with recommendations from experts on how to improve one or another aspect of politics, but these task forces are rare and always ignored. And these efforts almost never get to the thorny social justice issues raised by the critical-minded political scientists of the Caucus.

It turns out you would have to search far and wide beyond the Caucus to find political scientists debating how to conduct their scholarship in ways that will promote a more just political system. That is just not really part of the methodological debates in a discipline where adhering to scientific standards for good research is the end all and be all. In fact, I personally feel that even a lot of Critical Political Science these days is itself disconnected from taking on a bottom-up perspective that looks at politics in terms of how ordinary people experience it. I addressed this point head on in an interview with *Frank News* (so appropriately named). I put it this way:

Basically what it comes down to is what I always say to people on the left, "Why can't we just be like Denmark?" And they go, "Well, Denmark's a capitalist country." For god's sake, get a life. They are a capitalist country, yeah, but everybody gets health insurance, everybody gets paid family leave, they have extra benefits for the father to stay home to encourage gender equity, everybody gets a stipend to go to college for free, you can get

unemployment benefits for six years. I have friends on the left that say that's not good enough. Yet, if we were like Denmark, a lot of our economic concerns would start to go away. It starts to seem like people really aren't interested in solving the problems of inequality and poverty or what today is euphemistically referred to as social and economic hardship. They seem more interested in proving who's more virtuous or who's smarter, and who's more critical on the left. As I get older, it has made me more inclined to be disaffiliated. Like, I don't want to be a leftist anymore. I just want to be Danish, I guess. I don't know ...

I've always identified as blue-collar. My father didn't graduate from high school. He was a letter carrier and the president of our local letter carrier union. I was a letter carrier in that union. My mother was a bookkeeper. We weren't poor, you could do fine back then in those jobs. Now you can't.

I've always had this uneasy relationship with the left. I feel like, for a lot of them, their relationship is not with the letter carriers, it's with the academics they're arguing with. And that's always been, I think, a little bit of a chip on my shoulder. Like, well, you try delivering the mail for a week, and then you wouldn't have these debates about whether or not it's good enough to be Denmark. Right? Damn right it's good enough to be Denmark. That's sort of how I come at it.

Political Science as practiced by leftists nowadays is very much focused on political theory and much less focused on empirical work. That is also part of the problem: the left has become not just too academic, it's also become too theoretical. The left, even if it is appropriately critical of the existing structure of power is disconnected from ordinary people's struggles.

This relates to a major problem of the Democratic Party that President Joe Biden has sought to address. The Democratic Party is increasingly dominated by professionals and educated people who have really good policies, but they don't really understand who ordinary people are and what they need. (www.franknews.us/interviews/519/how-things-changed)

There are a few different points in my diatribe worth flagging. First, Political Science, even Critical Political Science, is arguably too often vulnerable to being more about itself than the politics we are supposed to be serving and improving and making more just (as my mentor Frances Fox Piven keeps reminding me). Second, if our analyses, especially those conducted by Critical Political Scientists, were more focused on taking a bottom-up

viewpoint we could further promote political change from the bottom up that would result in a politics that better served the interests of ordinary people.

Yet, a third point worth flagging is whether researchers should be including their own biography in their analyses. Reuben Miller and Nancy Naples are sociologists and things might be a bit different in their discipline where it is more acceptable to draw on your own personal first-hand experiences to add to your fieldwork and embellish the “gift of proximity.” But even a cursory survey quickly suggests that in Political Science getting to that idea is simply a bridge too far. Even the most critical of Critical Political Scientists are not known for including their personal standpoint as the vantage point for their research.

The gift of proximity is just that. It is a present we can give ourselves. It is its own double-entendre; it is a gift to be here now in the present in our own experience and to use that to ground our political analyses in the real world of political struggle in which we situate ourselves (see Derrida 1992, 108). In this way, our political analyses grow out of the political efforts in which we are engaged and informed by the people with whom we have solidarity and with whom we are working to make the world a better place. Rather than following the view from nowhere objectivism of scientistic Political Science, we should make explicit our situated standpoint, justify that perspective and use it to inform how we, along with our allies in struggle, see the world and the political challenges we are confronting. This is a more honest, robust objectivity that does not deny, but rather clarifies, who we are, how we got here, and how our personal experiences inform our political analyses.

Sometimes our political analyses can benefit not just from relying on our own personal biography but appreciating how other disciplines less tied to the scientism that afflicts much of mainstream Political Science can help us see the importance of doing just that. For me, it is often about how I combine Sociology and Political Science to make my analyses more personally poignant and politically connected. Like Miller and Naples, C. Wright Mills (1959, 6), was yet another sociologist with high political acumen, and he defined the “sociological imagination” as “the vivid awareness of the relationship

between personal experience and the wider society.” It enabled us to “grasp history and biography and the relations between the two within society” (Mills 1959, 6). In other words, as Lauren Griffin (2021) puts it, the sociological imagination “is the ability to understand how personal experiences are shaped by historically-conditioned social forces. You are your own person with your own story (biography), but you are influenced in a million ways by the social structure and people who came before you (history).”

For instance, when I wrote my memoir, *Becoming a Footnote: An Activist-Scholar Finds His Voice, Learns to Write, and Survives Academia* (2013), I was counseled by a close colleague, now deceased and sorely missed, to situate my personal struggle with the broader social context and connect my efforts to what I was trying to achieve with others politically. I quoted Mills as my inspiration. I was not just trying to place other people’s biographies in historical context, I was doing that by first doing it to myself. In another act of verisimilitude, what was good for the goose was good for the gander. I was the subject of my own analytical lens. In my memoir, I talked about how, as an interdisciplinary political sociologist, my personal struggle was to find and express my voice as an Activist-Scholar who was connected to anti-poverty struggles. I sought to see how I could make my analysis not just more personally poignant and more politically connected and perhaps then also more potent to my readers.

The lessons that autoethnography taught me are worthy of serious consideration for all who aspire to practicing a politically efficacious Critical Political Science. For my memoir, my main focus was that I struggled to write well enough so that a broad audience could appreciate what I was saying and how it connected to their lives. I tell the story of how I was a bad writer as a student for years and how I migrated to being a prolapsed academic writer who most non-specialists could never understand, let alone take seriously. This is a real issue for many academics including practitioners of Critical Political Science who seek to connect to ongoing political struggle and have their Political Science help the cause of achieving social justice. For years, I rationalized my writing deficiencies as a product of my addressing esoteric theoretical subjects necessitating an ethereal

kind of writing not easily grasped by most people, or really just about anybody. This kind of self-serving thinking only delayed my making political impact with allies, government decision-makers, and the general citizenry.

Autoethnography, even when not focused on the issue of writing, can help further the goal of achieving a politically efficacious Critical Political Science in a number of ways. First, it can make our scholarship more personally tangible, people can see the person behind or in the analysis and can better understand your motivations and your perspective. Second, autoethnography can better ground scholarship, research or analyses in the ongoing political struggles we are engaged in with allies. It can further the goal of making sure our academic work is connected to real political issues and political efforts rather than pretending it is enough that our work be seen as contributing to knowledge for its own sake. As Rogers Smith (2007) once said: knowledge doesn't have a sake. The whole idea of political knowledge is that it is political, it is to be something that informs politics. I recognize that this is by no means a simple issue as another of my mentors John G. Gunnell has so insightfully written about for decades (2019). Then again, nothing worth doing is necessarily done easily.

Karl Marx's (1845) Thesis XI still resonates for me: "The philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point, however, is to change it." Autoethnography can help us meet Marx's challenge. Don't be shy: put yourself in the picture, situate your analysis in terms of the personal and political struggles with which you are engaged, connect your analysis to those struggles, communicate with a wider audience that can make your work more politically efficacious. Don't be a scientific, falsely objectivistic, sadly detached, lonely and isolated academic scribbler. Visualize yourself as the Activist-Scholar you imagine yourself to be! Together we can make Critical Political Science realize its highest ideals.

But you know, once we fully embrace Marx's aphorism, we might not insist on Marx's critique of capitalism in toto, for it may put us at odds with the quotidian struggles in which we are enmeshed. We may fly less high, practice a more "middle-range theory" as C. Wright Mills (1959) called it, where we theorize only enough to place into

a relevant context the efforts we are trying to understand and inform. It is here where our analyses can help make a difference. As an anti-communist leftist, Mills chose not to rely strictly on Marxist political economy for his searing critiques of American institutions and how they served the powerful at the expense of ordinary people (Aronowitz 2012, 83; also see Barrow 2007). Mills feared rightly that orthodox Marxism was not only too abstract but also too alien to be able to resonate effectively with the American public. In fact, as a prominent public intellectual, he produced works of scholarship that connected effectively with the broader public and mainstream politics. Mills' famous critique *The Power Elite* (1956) stayed in print for over four decades. His analysis was echoed in President Dwight D. Eisenhower's farewell address in 1961 where he warned of the dangers of the "military-industrial complex." Mills' work was profoundly influential concerning the struggle of the American people against consolidated power. How far has academic social science fallen from that model of political connectedness! I don't know if we can get it back and if we do whether it will be via Twitter but we should try. When we do, it might be that we will mostly be working with people to make the U.S. more like Denmark, where ordinary people's basic needs are much more effectively addressed.

SANFORD F. SCHRAM

References

- Aronowitz, Stanley. 2012. *Taking It Big: C. Wright Mills and the Making of Political Intellectuals*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 2007. "Plain Marxists, Sophisticated Marxists, and C. Wright Mills. 'The Power Elite'." *Science & Society* 71, no. 4 (October): 400–30.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1992. *Given Time: I. Counterfeit Money*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Ellis, Carolyn and Arthur Bochner. 2000. "Autoethnography, Personal Narrative, Reflexivity: Researcher as Subject." In *The Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed.), edited by Norman Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, 733–68. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Griffin, Lauren. 2021. "Sociology with Ms. Griffin." <https://professorgriffin.weebly.com/sociological-imagination.html>.
- Gunnell, John G. 2019. *Conventional Realism and Political Inquiry: Channeling Wittgenstein*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

SANFORD F. SCHRAM

- Marx, Karl. 1845. *Theses on Feuerbach*. XI (Originally unpublished marginalia). www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/theses/theses.htm.
- Miller, Reuben Jonathan. 2021. *Halfway Home: Race, Punishment, and the Afterlife of Mass Incarceration*. New York: Little, Brown and Company.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1956. *The Power Elite*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1959. *The Sociological Imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Naples, Nancy A. 2003. *Feminism and Method: Ethnography, Discourse Analysis, and Activist Research*. New York: Routledge.
- Schram, Sanford F. 1995. *Words of Welfare: The Poverty of social Science and the Social Science of Poverty*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Schram, Sanford F. 2005. "Return to Politics: Perestroika, Phronesis, and Postparadigmatic Political Science." In *Perestroika!: The Raucous Rebellion in Political Science*, edited by Kristen Renwick Monroe, 103–14. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Schram, Sanford F. 2013. *Becoming a Footnote: An Activist-Scholar, Finds His Voice, Learns to Write and Survives Academia*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Shdaimah, Corey S., Roland W. Stahl and Sanford F. Schram. 2011. *Change Research: A Case Study on Collaborative Methods for Social Workers and Advocates*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Smith, Rogers M. 2005. "Of Means and Meaning: The Challenges of Doing Good Political Science." In *Perestroika!: The Raucous Rebellion in Political Science*, edited by Kristen Renwick Monroe, 525–33. New Haven: Yale University Press.

See also

Sanford F. Schram; Critique of Pluralism; Intellectuals; Phenomenology

38. Genealogy

Genealogy is a methodological approach to the study of socio-political phenomena that has become an important tool for critical political theorists to clarify the historical production of power and subjectivity. This entry examines how genealogy was developed by Friedrich Nietzsche and, more particularly, by Michel Foucault in order to assess some of its strengths and weaknesses in relation to critical political science. Genealogy has become an important methodological tool for critical political theorists since its deployment by Michel Foucault in his books *The History of Sexuality* (1990) and *Discipline and Punish* (1995).

The practice of genealogy draws its initial inspiration from Nietzsche's account of the revaluation of values in *On the Genealogy of Morals* (1998 [1887]). This approach to the history of ideas traces the changing meaning and the historical contingency of terms and concepts in their relationship to the distribution and enactment of power. The method traces these changing meanings by examining the production of knowledge/power complexes within historically specific political institutions and socio-cultural milieus. Genealogy can thus be seen as part of a larger movement of thinking within modernity that brings together a focus on language and the terms of its material-cultural production as developed by a wide range of thinkers, including Raymond Williams, Walter Benjamin, Theodor Adorno, Jacques Derrida, Judith Butler, Donna Haraway, and various feminist, queer, and critical race theorists.

More specifically, genealogy provides a way of thinking about socio-political phenomenon in terms of how the meaning of certain utterances and practices obtain their sense within certain disciplining processes, and how those processes themselves undergo change and even replacement over time. In tracing these transformations of meaning and context, genealogy reveals the historical contingency of a given set of practices and understandings and reveals that which is putatively "natural" is actually political and thus necessarily subject to critical assessment. Genealogy, like all critical approaches, is both a descriptive and normative enterprise. At a descriptive level, both Nietzsche and Foucault were concerned to show how

their genealogical approaches reflect defensible ways of understanding the historical world and the historically produced present. Nietzsche's genealogical approach was grounded in his training as a philologist and emerges in connection to his theory of language as a historical and contingent phenomenon related to pragmatic enactments of power. All language, far from being a repository of ahistorical truths, entails an originary founding violence, often reflecting a concerted effort, an enactment of power, to frame the world in a particular way. At the level of how language works, Nietzsche (2006) suggests, the mediated basis of language entails a distance between the language and the world or truth that it purports to represent as there is no direct connection between the concept and the thing-in-itself. Nonetheless, Nietzsche champions his ability to stand above his own historical epoch and achieve the epistemological distance necessary to objectively describe the transformation of conceptual meanings, practical systems, and the distribution of social-political power over time. Likewise, Foucault (1984, 76) describes genealogy as "gray, meticulous, and patiently, documentary" to underline its commitment to scholarly description.

For both thinkers, genealogy is a tool for describing and understanding the operation of power. In *On a Genealogy of Morals*, for example, Nietzsche investigates how Christian morality gained power through the transformation of key moral terms, such as the concept of good, which Christianity refashioned to reflect the qualities possessed and enacted by a priestly caste in its successful quest to wrestle power away from their stronger aristocratic rivals. For Foucault, his genealogies develop ways of thinking about power as it relates to the production of knowledge, identifying its expression in terms of a pastoral power and in the emergence of a modern disciplinary power that are both distinct from and complementary to the kinds of sovereign power characteristic of the pre-modern and early modern eras. Genealogy, for both Nietzsche and Foucault, is alert to how power always functions through and in relation to the production of knowledge, combining to produce particular kinds of "discursive practices." Foucault's work, for example, traces the ways in which disciplinary power arises with the emergence of the human sciences that codify and

catalog, and which are appropriated to police individuals and populations. The enactment of this kind of biopower occurs through local mechanisms of control and production, such as the medical clinic, the classroom, the military, and the prison, but it is also taken up by the state, whose sovereign power is itself now inflected by biopolitical concerns (Agamben 1998).

These insights about power are, in turn, linked to genealogy's critical focus on the production of subjectivity. Whereas liberal, early-enlightenment, notions of the subject depict an always-already-there, free-standing individual capable of entering into rational negotiations across a variety of concerns, genealogies reveal the ways in which subjectivity is produced by the play of power within historically specific disciplining practices and systems. Genealogy thus uncovers processes of subjectivization, or subjectification, in which knowledge/power complexes produce subjects who understand themselves and others in particular kinds of ways. These processes of subjectivization, however, are never merely ideational or discursive. Genealogy, as developed by Nietzsche and Foucault, analyses processes of subjectivization with an attentiveness to how knowledge/power complexes reach into the body and discipline the mind/body by habituating it to the point that certain knowledges and practices become second nature. As Foucault (1983, 83) puts it when describing Nietzsche's genealogical work: "Genealogy, as an analysis of descent, is thus situated within the articulation of the body and history. Its task is to expose a body totally imprinted by history and the process of history's destruction of the body."

Along these lines, Sandra Lee Bartky (1998, 27) goes beyond Foucault's blindness to the sexism of his own categories of analysis to deploy his genealogical framework to describe the ways in which women's subjectivity in the late twentieth century in the United States is produced in ways that in "appearance and gesture is recognizably feminine" by a pervasive male gaze. Her analysis uncovers how the imperatives of heteropatriarchy intersect with patterns of capitalist consumption to promote and produce the appearance, motility, and behaviors of women. In this respect, genealogy broadens the vocabulary of materialist social critique and augments the Marxist analysis of the subject-forming forces of work, eco-

nomic emplacement, and ideology, even as it disputes that tradition's assumptions about power being organized or reducible to the working of an economically-driven totality.

The relation between genealogical approaches and the Marxist tradition that it both augments and troubles is, in fact, crucial for understanding the potential of genealogical approaches for a critical politics. Whereas a Marxist-inspired critical politics has often understood itself as a response to and as a theoretical-political engagement with capitalism as a social-political totality, genealogy has alerted critical social thought to the particularities of power's operations in specific disciplinary, or power-knowledge, complexes that cannot simply be reduced to the effects of the market, opening up investigations into the workings of patriarchy, heteronormativity, and racism, to offer a partial set of potential categories. In turning critical thought towards the particular, genealogical approaches have both opened up the Marxist insistence on the totality of the socio-political-economic system to considerations of how power/knowledge complexes are joined together in various disciplining systems (patriarchy, racism, heteronormativity, etc.) and raised questions about how critical social and political theorists might imagine plausible political responses to the differentiated operations of power that define who we are. At the level of description, genealogical inquiries are thus quite compatible with the explosion of intersectional analyses in social thought (which is not to argue that Foucauldian genealogy should be credited with the rise of intersectionality, whose lineage can be traced more directly through the work of Black feminist theorists (Hancock 2016)).

However, it is important to stress that Foucauldian genealogies remain compatible with the general materialist-critical thrust of the Marxist tradition. In fact, class struggle and the pervasive, mediating effects of the capitalist economy remain important aspects of Foucault's effort to describe the more filigree workings of power of which capitalist relations play a fundamental role (Cook 2018, 35–9). For example, Wendy Brown's *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism's Stealth Revolution* (2015) leans on Foucault's genealogical legacy to trace the practical and ideational imperatives of a politically ascendant neoliberalism, uncovering how its pervasive reach threatens to colonize the entirety of

our contemporary social lives, eviscerating the very existence of public institutions organized around the provision of public goods. Or, to provide another example of the economic-materialist potentials of critical genealogical approaches, Nancy Fraser's and Linda Gordon's "A Genealogy of Dependency: Tracing a Keyword of the U.S. Welfare State" (1994) utilizes a genealogical approach to uncover how the key term of "dependency" was deployed by opponents of United States' welfare programs as an unproblematic term throughout the 1980s and 1990s to judge the iconic figure of the Black, single-mother, "welfare queen." However, Fraser and Gordon (1994, 311) claim to specifically depart from Foucault in welcoming "normative political reflection" connected to "a feminist interest in imagining emancipatory alternatives."

As developed by Nietzsche and Foucault, however, genealogy has always entailed a normative dimension. For Nietzsche, the enactment of power by the Judaeo-Christian priestly caste, repeated and reinforced by the assumptions of modern rationalism, has led to what he understands as the disastrous mediocrity of the leveling democratic spirit characteristic of modernity. In that sense, at least, Nietzsche's critical genealogical approach seems at odds with contemporary critical theory's efforts on behalf of those who suffer under the weight of capitalist, white supremacist, patriarchal, and heteronormative rationalities and practices, and this reminds us that genealogy might be effectively deployed for non-progressive ends. Thinkers like William Connolly (1991, 20–23) have, nonetheless, deployed Nietzsche's genealogy of morality for progressive ends, particularly in terms of analysing and responding to the politics of resentment at the heart of the reactionary right's electoral viability in the United States and Europe.

Foucault, however, has more clearly undertaken his genealogical commitments on the behalf of those who have been marginalized and those who suffer. Genealogical investigations reveal that where there is power there is resistance, thus linking the situated knowledges of those who occupy subordinate socio-political positions and the work of intellectuals. Genealogical investigations, Foucault (2003, 8) argues, entail "both a meticulous rediscovery of struggles and the raw memory of fights." Genealogy

couples "together ... scholarly erudition and local memories, which allows us to constitute a historical knowledge of struggles and to make use of that knowledge in contemporary tactics." Patricia Hill Collins (1990) makes a similar point in her efforts to articulate a black feminist standpoint theory as a critically articulated perspective that brings together the situated knowledges of African-American women and Black intellectuals' theoretical knowledge into a kind of partnership.

Foucault, toward the end of his life, explicitly linked a genealogical approach with what he refers to as the difficult work of freedom, focusing on how genealogy uncovers both constraints and potential enactments of freedom and empowerment within the context of particular disciplining milieus. In his important late essay, "What is Enlightenment?", Foucault (1997) imagines the emergence of the human subject within the particular disciplining systems that one finds oneself inhabiting and which thus mark the limits constitutive of subjectivity. Foucault here articulates a "limit attitude" that endorses the ongoing possibility of a critical interrogation of those limits and their possible transgression as part of an always historically situated emancipatory project. Foucault (1997, 315–16) explicitly links this limit attitude to genealogical critique "in the sense that it will not deduce from the form of what we are what it is impossible for us to do and to know; but it will separate out, from the contingency that has made us what we are, the possibility of no longer being, doing, or thinking what we are, do, or think." Foucault (1997, 316) thus links genealogy to the ethos implicit in modernity, particularly as it is expressed in the attitude of the enlightenment, that seeks to "to give impetus, as far and as wide as possible, to the undefined work of freedom" in the context of the particular games of power that it investigates. In this sense, genealogy can be understood as the necessary part of any critical politics that raises the question of what possible difference can be imagined within the context of the present and thus enables our ability to participate in the autonomous affirmation or refusal of what our present entails.

Genealogy, then, can be understood affirmatively in terms of its role in cultivating our capacity for autonomy through its own disciplining manoeuvres. The genea-

logical endeavor refines how we might see the critical evaluation of who we are as the necessary first step of any affirmative program or declaration. Whereas Nietzsche was fond of quoting Pindar's exhortation "to become who you are!", Foucault (1997, 319) would insist that his limit attitude entails a gesture of potentially refusing who you are, "in which the critique of what we are is at one and the same time the historical analysis of the limits imposed on us and an experiment with the possibility of going beyond them." In fostering a critical orientation towards the disciplining practices in which we are produced, the limit attitude that Foucault develops in conjunction with his critical genealogies provides what can be recognized as a counter-discipline capable of organizing our approach to or our attitude about who we are within the socio-political world that we inhabit, a kind of aesthetic orientation to how we comport ourselves politically and ethically. Some have worried that, in Nietzsche's and Foucault's hands, any genealogical critique of power seems to be ultimately committed to a kind of aesthetic self-fashioning, a way of giving one's life a kind of at least loose coherence through the fashioning of one's life as if it were an open-ended artistic practice.

In that case, so the criticism goes, genealogy would lack the normative yardsticks that would guide an ethically or morally defensible response to the power formations to which it responds. In any genealogical analysis, however, that analysis is always related to a way of exiting the disciplinary practices or system of power that it critiques, and thus carries with it at least something of a weak normative force of opposing the ways in which any such system works to deny the autonomy of the subjects that it produces, the ability of subjects to say "yes" or "no" to the greater systems that constitute who they are. In any case, we have seen that, in the work of thinkers like Brown and Fraser and Gordon, genealogical approaches can be intentionally deployed in pursuit of more specific normative goals in line with the critical political scientific and theoretical tradition. These kinds of works, in fact, point to one way in which genealogical approaches can be linked to the necessarily collective dimension of political struggles. If combatting the ways in which we are produced as certain kinds of subjects by disciplinary formations

is an important step for a critical politics, there is still the need to respond to these formations at the level of policy and legal enforcement, regardless of the collective tactics through which those ends are pursued. But here, too, the local specificity of genealogy has something to offer, resisting the grand schemes of a political subservience to some totalizing end. At the level of political prescription, genealogical particularism has underwritten efforts to reimagine solidarity in terms of the multiple subjectivities posited by genealogical renderings of the socio-political world, from Mouffe and Laclau's *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy* to Hardt and Negri's *Empire*. That reimagining of solidarity and collective commitment is also a crucial part of the critical political tradition, enjoining the reflexive moment that is at the heart of the critical enterprise.

MICHAEL LIPSCOMB

References

- Agamben, Giorgio. 1998. *Homer Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, translated by Daniel Helen-Roazer. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bartky, Sandra Lee. 1998. "Foucault, Femininity, and the Modernization of Patriarchal Power." In *The Politics of Women's Bodies: Sexuality, Appearance, and Behavior*, edited by Rose Weitz, 64–85. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, Wendy. 2015. *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism's Stealth Revolution*. Brooklyn, NY: Zone Books.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 1990. "Defining Black Feminist Thought." In *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York: Routledge.
- Connolly, William E. 1991. *Identity and Difference: Democratic Negotiations of Political Paradox*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Cook, Deborah. 2018. *Adorno, Foucault and the Critique of the West*. New York: Verso.
- Foucault, Michel. 1984. "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History." In *The Foucault Reader*, edited by Paul Rabinow. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, Michel. 1990. *The History of Sexuality: Volume 1: An Introduction*, translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, Michel. 1995. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, translated from the French by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, Michel. 1997. "What is Enlightenment?" In *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*, translated by Robert Hurley and others. New York: The New Press: New York.

- Foucault, Michel. 2003. *"Society Must Be Defended": Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975–1976*, translated by David Macey. New York: Picador.
- Fraser, Nancy and Linda Gordon. 1994. "A Genealogy of Dependency: Tracing a Keyword of the U.S. Welfare State." *Signs* 19, no. 2 (Winter): 309–36.
- Hancock, Ange-Marie. 2016. *Intersectionality: An Intellectual History*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2001. *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Laclau, Ernesto and Chantal Mouffe. 2014. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. New York: Verso.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. 2006. "On Truth and Lie in an Extra-Moral Sense." In *The Nietzsche Reader*, edited by Keith Ansell-Pearson and Duncan Large. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. 1998 [1887]. *On the Genealogy of Morals*, translated by Maudemarie Clark. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.

39. Thorstein Veblen's critical social theory

Thorstein Bunde Veblen (1857–1929) was both a social theorist in the grand tradition of the nineteenth century and a renegade intellectual whose radical views challenged the orthodoxies of academic thinking in the twentieth century. His lifetime coincided with the rise of the large corporation and the transformation of economic, social, and political life in the era of corporate capitalism. Like many of his contemporaries, Veblen sought to decipher the driving forces behind these developments. What he documented in greater depth and with more acuity than any thinker of his generation was the manner in which the rise of the large corporation had fomented a reorganization of power in American society. This monumental contribution is not widely appreciated today. Also generally overlooked is Veblen's analysis of the origins of patriarchy. For Veblen, patriarchy and class domination in capitalist societies are both rooted in the institution of ownership, just as both are sustained by "animistic" (ideological) habits of thought.

Veblen's analyses of the institution of ownership, patriarchy, and corporate power must be assessed within the context of his broader social theory and its unifying themes, namely: (1) the dynamic interrelationships between instinct, habits of thought, environment, and social change in human evolution; (2) the essential contradiction between business and industry rooted in the evolutionary past and sustained by the instinctual dominance of "pecuniary exploit" over "workman-like efficiency"; and (3) the self-delusion of the species through ideological and animistic thinking and its implications for the structure of power in society. As will become apparent, the methodology and normative assumptions of Veblen's evolutionary theory stood in stark contrast to those of social Darwinism which, in the early twentieth century, had become an ideological bulwark in defense of the status quo.

Veblen maintains that from its earliest beginnings, the social existence of human beings, like that of other species, has been a struggle for survival. In the course of this struggle, a process of natural selection has compelled the gradual adaptation of human

nature and behavior to changing social conditions. Human institutions and their corresponding modes of thought, however, are not only a result of a "selective and adaptive process," but they are also in themselves "efficient factors of selection" (Veblen 1953, 131). Social change or evolution, according to Veblen, is therefore a product of a complex process in which human thought and behavior, by adapting to a changing social environment, transforms the institutional basis for later selection. Human behavior, moreover, is rooted in and conditioned by a complex of "instinctive proclivities and tropismatic attitudes" (Veblen 1918, 1). Instinctive action is purposeful or teleological; that is, it "involves consciousness and adaptation to an end aimed at" (Veblen 1918, 4, 30–31; 1953, 29). Unlike tropismatic behavior, which is purely psychological and cannot be consciously altered or controlled, instinctive behavior is shaped by social norms, customs, and habits. Consequently, the way in which the instinctive ends of life are worked out will depend upon a host of cultural factors (Veblen 1918, 6–8; 1953, 146).

Instinctive action, according to Veblen, is always a product of an interplay and overlapping of the various instinctive dispositions. Because of the interdependence of human instincts, the modification or accentuation of one instinct due to environmental factors will result in a "mutual contamination" of other instincts and thereby bias the process of selective adaptation (Veblen 1918, 11, 40–41). At any given point in the evolution of a society, human nature therefore consists of a set of instinctive proclivities which has been selected for specific economic and social conditions. But once modified, instinctive dispositions will affect future selection by either facilitating or hampering adaptation. In Veblen's view, this fact clearly reveals the fallacy of the simplistic idea of progress often associated with theories of human social evolution. In fact, he characterizes the notion that "the institutional outcome of men's native dispositions will be sound and salutary" as "an article of uncritical faith [taken] from the historic belief in a beneficent Order of Nature" (Veblen 1918, 50, n.1).

Veblen's analysis of instinctive behavior focuses primarily on three major instincts – workmanship, the parental bent, and idle curiosity. Essential to the material well-being of a people, workmanship refers to the human

propensity for effective work including the efficient use of resources and technological mastery (Veblen 1918, 25–6, 31–7). The parental bent induces a concern not only for the welfare of one's offspring, but also for the community as a whole. Idle curiosity motivates the quest for knowledge for its own sake. Human curiosity is "idle," Veblen (1918, 269–70) argues, because it has no utilitarian aim. This does not imply, however, that the knowledge produced by this instinctive disposition can have no practical application. Indeed, the development of science and technology provide ample evidence to the contrary (Veblen 1918, 84–9).

Veblen identifies four major eras or periods of social evolution, each of which corresponds to a different stage in the advance of technology and social organization – the era of primitive or peaceable savagery, the barbaric or predatory era, the era of the handicraft economy, and the modern era of machine technology. It is during the transition from the period of peaceable savagery, which is characterized by a crude technology and a subsistence economy, to the stage of barbarism, that the institution of ownership emerges (Veblen 1934, 42–9; 1918, 140–46). Ownership becomes established when societies recognize an individual's "customary right of use and abuse over an object which is obviously not an organic part of his person" (Veblen 1934, 47). Veblen (1934, 44–9; 1953, 33–4) argues that this practice first appears in cultures in which goods and people, especially women, are seized and hence claimed as property and that the ownership of property presupposes certain technological advances which make possible the accumulation of wealth which, in turn, often encourages aggression (Veblen 1918, 149–61). Captive humans were obviously not part of the organic person of the captor and could be readily apprehended as possessions or trophies of war. As trophies, women brought distinction to their male owners who eventually created the institution of marriage as a means of laying exclusive claim to their captive property. Veblen (1934, 48) thus concluded that the institution of "ownership-marriage" seemed to be "the original both of private property and of the patriarchal household." As the institution of ownership-marriage acquired legitimacy and came to represent "the good and beautiful attitude of the man toward

the woman," it became necessary to arrange the marriage of free women, especially the daughters of men of high standing. By the same token, status and reputability among males, which was achieved by a more or less constant demonstration of prowess (or emulative behavior) could not be sustained without marrying (owning) a woman or women. For these reasons, Veblen surmised, the marriage ritual or ceremony of "feigned capture" originated and, in time, came "to be appreciated unreflectingly as a deliverance of common-sense and enlightened reason." The price of social acceptance for women was servitude. Free women – that is, "masterless, unattached" women – were shunned or relegated to a lower social status than "captured" women. Exceptions to this social convention could be found in societies that had enjoyed a long period of "peaceable industrial life" in which the maternal household had thrived. In these (non-predatory) maternal cultures, "the household of the unattached woman" developed in place of ownership-marriage, although the two institutions usually blended to create a hybrid form at a much later date (Veblen 1934, 56–61).

Veblen's analysis of the original marriage ceremony provides insight into the pervasiveness in both predatory and modern societies of animism, the practice of attributing a teleology or purpose to inanimate things or events. The barbarian, he observed, "looks upon external objects and sequences naively, as organic and individual things, and as expressions of a propensity working toward an end." Ritual is accepted as reality by the animistic mind: "if once the motions leading to a desired consummation have been rehearsed in the accredited form and sequence, the same substantial result will be attained as that produced by the process imitated." Understood in this way, religious ceremonies, anthropomorphic beliefs, superstitions, and ritualized social practices all have their basis in animistic thinking. The very concept of ownership is animistic in that it attributes to the individual certain intangible powers (e.g., prowess or force) associated with capture or possession, whereas, in reality, ownership is a social institution (Veblen 1934, 58).

Veblen's account of the historical development of ownership significantly influenced his general theory of social evolution. The institution of ownership-marriage in predatory societies, he argued, gave rise to a class

division – a leisure class and a working class – based on a discrimination between employments: the “honorific employments which involve a large measure of prowess” and “the humiliating employments, which call for diligence and into which the sturdier virtues do not enter” (Veblen 1934, 50, 93; 1953, 42–60). Veblen explained that the “invidious distinction” between exploit (prowess) and industry flowed from the institution of ownership and its underlying motive of pecuniary emulation. The possession of wealth became a symbol of prowess and thereby conferred honor just as the lack of wealth relegated one to an ordinary or ignoble social position.

Both patriarchy and class domination, therefore, had their origin in the institution of ownership-marriage which nourished, and was nourished by, predatory and animistic habits of thought. Besides ownership-marriage, no other convention better illustrated the barbarian status of women in modern society than did the social rules that applied to women’s dress. Dress (which must be distinguished from mere clothing) originated with “adornment” in primitive peoples and evolved to represent the wealth of the “social unit” in more advanced predatory societies. As trophies and later (captive) wives, women, “in a peculiar degree,” served the purpose of exhibiting “the pecuniary strength” of the male owner-husband “by means of a conspicuously unproductive consumption of goods.” Conspicuous consumption demonstrated prowess by virtue of the capacity of the male head of household to display “conspicuous waste” (Veblen 1934, 68, 74–5; 1953, 118–31).

In Veblen’s (1918, 209–98; 1923, 40–49) evolutionary scheme, the handicraft era marks the transition from the predatory to the peaceable commercial phase of pecuniary culture; it constitutes the pre-industrial phase of capitalism, the stage in which the small-scale competitive economy develops around the activities of craftsmen and petty traders. By combining technological mastery with the quest for profit, the craftsman joined the skills of industry and business. As it became increasingly productive, however, the handicraft system planted the seeds of its own destruction. Technological advances in various crafts eventually made the cost of equipment prohibitive for most craftsmen. Soon crafts became organized within industrial plants which were owned by individuals

with sufficient wealth to purchase the means of production. Improvements in methods of communication, transportation, and trade facilitated, directly and indirectly, the process of industrial advance. Eventually, the handicraft system broke down, or outgrew itself, and the rudiments of an industrial system began to take shape. In the process, however, a division of labor separated the two skills once embodied in the craftsman. Under the new system, pecuniary control was vested in a class of owners while the tasks of production were consigned to a propertyless class of workers (Veblen 1918, 211).

Though the Industrial Revolution in England officially ushered in the era of machine technology, its formative principle – the dominance of business over industry – grew out of the handicraft economy. The progressive separation of these two realms of economic activity constitutes the dominant trend of modern technological development. With the ascendancy of the business class, moreover, new relationships of power are established. Society becomes organized in the interests of business or profit making; and pecuniary principles or habits of thought soon acquire “supreme dominance ... both as standards of efficiency and as canons of conduct.” This “pecuniary system of social organization” further institutes “class divergence of material interests, class prerogative and differential hardship, and an accentuated class disparity in the consumption of goods” (Veblen 1918, 187, 216). For Veblen, the rise of the bourgeoisie in the era of modern industry initiates the final conquest of exploit over industry.

Veblen argues that the first great class of business leaders, the so-called “captains of industry,” were in actuality entrepreneurs who possessed, albeit in varying degrees, considerable industrial expertise. It is during the “era of free competition” – roughly the period which “lies between the Industrial Revolution of the eighteenth century and the rise of corporation finance in the nineteenth” – that the captain of industry emerges as a major economic, political, and social force (Veblen 1923, 102; 1932, 70–71). Yet, during the latter half of the nineteenth century, as technology became more complex and scientific in character, as the efficiency and output of industrial production increased, and as business transactions expanded, “the function of the entrepreneur, the captain of industry,

gradually fell apart in a two-fold division of labor, between the business manager and the office work on the one side and the technician and the industrial work on the other side" (Veblen 1923, 101, 106). With this most recent split between business and industry, which amounts to a division between financial and industrial management with the former retaining ultimate control, the era of corporate dominance begins (Veblen 1923, 205–397; 1978, 7–127; 1933, 35–113).

The rise of the large corporation in the closing decades of the nineteenth century, Veblen argues, coincided with the failure of the competitive system to prevent excessive (i.e., unprofitable) production. In order to limit production and thereby prevent retrenchment of assets or earnings, the pecuniary captains increasingly resorted to the corporate form of business enterprise (Veblen 1923, 78–9; 1978, 123–7). This development signaled the complete separation of business and industry, an event that Veblen views as a necessary precondition for the consolidation of the power of the business class. As business institutions, corporations comprise the institutional foundation of the modern credit economy; they are the primary means through which the business class controls the economy and society at large. The corporation, he explains, "is a business concern, not an industrial unit;" moreover, it is a "business concern which has been created by a capitalization of funds, and which accordingly rests on credit." While corporations may have indirectly facilitated industrial expansion, their purpose has always been investment for profit. "Business enterprise may be said to have reached its majority," he asserts, "when the corporation came to take first place and became the master institution of civilized life" (Veblen 1923, 82, 86). Modern business enterprise and the credit economy upon which it rests, Veblen argues, are designed to stabilize prices, and therefore profits, by regulating competition and limiting production. Because they provide for centralization of control, allow for routinization of business transactions, and create a greater interdependence within the financial community, corporations constitute the institutional foundation of the new order of business. Although the banking and industrial sectors were interrelated through corporate mergers and interlocking directorates, the lords of finance,

in Veblen's view, retained ultimate power through their control of credit and capital (Veblen 1923, 226–32; 1932, 47–9; 1933, 89–92). The rise of the business corporation therefore represents the demise of the captain of industry and the triumph of the modern business leader, the "captain of finance."

With the advent of this latest stage of capitalism, the business class ensures its dominance through control of the state which ultimately depends upon a broad ideological consensus rooted in the habits of thought of a people. Control over the production and dissemination of ideas therefore is of vital importance to the perpetuation of existing power relationships, as evidenced by the fact that the system of higher education continues to be administered on the basis of business-like principles, to propagate the ideas of pecuniary culture, and to serve the needs of the business class (Veblen 1913, 1–134, 148–69).

For Veblen, the prime mover in human social evolution is technology (technical knowledge), which initially served the salutary ends of workmanship but, in so doing, also contributed to emulative behavior and the beginnings of predatory society. During each era of social evolution, technology largely determined the economic structure of society and hence the conditions under which instinctual proclivities would be expressed. Measured solely by the growth of technology, each era represented an advance over its predecessor. At the same time, the habits of thought that directed the application of technical knowledge continued to be shaped by a mixture of workmanlike efficiency and exploit. The essential contradiction of this developmental process, what one might term the great irony of human history, is that insofar as human beings remain captive to predatory habits of thought, they are not able to realize the full productive potential of their own creations; but these habits of thought also encourage the growth of technology and industry. And so it goes.

Despite its profound fatalism, Veblen's critical analysis of corporate power was the most influential and insightful of the early twentieth century. In many respects, it remains relevant a century later as corporate capitalism continues to expand and as corporate power consolidates on a global scale.

SCOTT R. BOWMAN

References

- Veblen, Thorstein. 1923. *Absentee Ownership and Business Enterprise in Recent Times*. New York: B.W. Huebsch.
- Veblen, Thorstein. 1934. *Essays in Our Changing Order*, edited by Leon Ardzrooni. New York: The Viking Press.
- Veblen, Thorstein. 1932. *The Engineers and the Price System*. 1921. Reprint, New York: The Viking Press.
- Veblen, Thorstein. 1918. *The Higher Learning in America: A Memorandum on the Conduct of Universities by Businessmen*. New York: B.W. Huebsch.
- Veblen, Thorstein. 1918. *The Instinct of Workmanship and the State of the Industrial Arts*. 1914. Reprint, New York: B.W. Huebsch.
- Veblen, Thorstein. 1990. *The Place of Science in Modern Civilization*. 1919. Reprint, New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Veblen, Thorstein. 1978. *The Theory of Business Enterprise*. 1904. Reprint, New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Veblen, Thorstein. 1953. *The Theory of the Leisure Class: An Economic Study of Institutions*. Reprint, 1899. New York: Mentor Books.
- Veblen, Thorstein. 1933. *The Vested Interests and the Common Man*. 1919. Reprint, New York: The Viking Press.

Further readings

- Dorfman, Joseph. 1934. *Thorstein Veblen and His America*. New York: The Viking Press.
- Diggins, John P. 1978. *The Bard of Savagery: Thorstein Veblen and Modern Social Theory*. New York: The Seabury Press.
- Horowitz, Irving Louis, ed. 2017. *Veblen's Century: A Collective Portrait*. 2002. Reprint, New York: Routledge.

See also

- Power Structure Analysis; Feminist Critiques of Political Science

40. Critical media studies

The study of politics is, in important ways, also the study of communication technologies or media. For most citizens, much of their experience and understanding of the world is filtered through media. As Marshall McLuhan (1962, 1 (emphasis added)) famously put it, media create unique social environments that modify “*forms of thought and the organization of experience in society and politics.*” Moreover, as communication technologies change, so too do the forms of thought, systems of governance, and attendant politics that enjoy currency. For example, in the world of “primary orality” (Ong 1982), or the world that existed prior to the invention of the alphabet and writing, politics was largely a local and communal (if hierarchical) affair because word-of-mouth was the principal way to communicate and convey the events of the day. Over time, politics and all that it entails has repeatedly been transformed by the development of new communication technologies, including writing, printing, photography, telegraphy, telephony, broadcasting, and most recently digital and social media.

To understand politics, therefore, it is vital to attend both to the ever-changing nature of our media and to the theories of how media shape and influence our social environment as well as our feelings, thoughts, and behaviors within that environment. Toward this end, we approach political science through the lens of critical media studies, suggesting how the theories of Marxism, organizational studies, pragmatism, cultural studies, feminism, and queer theory might enhance and contribute to the multidisciplinary study of politics. Importantly, the first three perspectives we discuss focus on the media industry, while the latter three focus on media texts. As such, they draw upon a diverse array of historical, critical, and interpretive theories and perspectives.

Marxism

Marxism is a social and political theory rooted in the idea that “society is the history of class struggles” (Marx and Engels 2004). Its central premise is that the mode of production in society, meaning its underlying economic base, which includes both the forces of

production (natural resources, technologies of production, labor power, etc.) and relations of production (ownership and labor practices), determines the cultural superstructure of society, which includes institutions such as family, religion, politics, law, education, and media. As a theory, Marxism is both materialist and historical. It is materialist, rather than idealist, in its assumption that the natural processes and concrete phenomenon of the material world precede and, therefore, shape human consciousness. It is historical, rather than static, in its recognition that material conditions fluctuate over time, thus creating new forms of thought and social organization. Marxism has direct utility for political scientists seeking to understand varying systems of political governance, but it also has utility for understanding the media institutions that prop up those systems.

The structure and function of media institutions vary greatly around the globe, ranging from independent and democratic to state-run and autocratic. Marxism affords a set of critical tools for analysing and evaluating what media look like in a given society. In the late capitalist economy of the United States, for instance, media ownership is characterized by concentration, conglomeration, integration, and multinationalism. These traits, in turn, influence the strategic workings of media institutions, which are driven by a desire to maximize profits. Among the key strategies of profit maximization are synergy, planned obsolescence, a logic of safety, celebrity and spectacle, joint ventures, and advertising. Collectively, these strategic economic aims are biased toward neoliberal ideology, a two-party political system, and cultural imperialism. By analysing how material economic conditions shape the structure and practice of a media systems, political scientists are better positioned to assess the role that media play in creating, sustaining, and sometimes challenging governing apparatuses.

Organizational studies

Just as Marxism offers one set of critical tools for understanding the structure and role of media institutions in society, so too does the work in critical organization studies, which views media companies as networks of ordered relationships and coordinated activities directed toward a specific goal (Cheney

et al. 2004, 7–8). Like all organizations, media companies have two basic dimensions: structure and process. Structure refers to the organization of a company into distinct, specialized units, to the management of those units, and to the professional norms that govern work. Process refers to the actions and behaviors of individuals within an organization. These two dimensions are, to some extent, in tension with one another, and how that tension plays out shapes the organizational culture. That culture manifests itself in the ritual performances of employees, the stories they tell, official texts and documents, management practices, and uses of technology. By studying these outward expressions of corporate culture, media scholars can understand how an organizational culture shapes the products it produces. The study of film production companies, for instance, sheds light on the media product known as “films.”

No organizational culture has received more attention in the field of media studies than the news media. Given the central role that the news media play in keeping citizens informed on political issues and related policy matters, this research seems especially relevant to political scientists. Studies of news organizations have focused on the emergence of journalistic norms surrounding the gathering and reporting of the news. News gathering conventions related to centralized news agencies, journalistic beats, and punditry, for instance, work to ensure that what counts as “news” is rather narrowly defined. Similarly, news reporting conventions have been shown to reinforce four information biases: personalization, dramatization, fragmentation, and authority-disorder (Bennett 2016). These reporting conventions overwhelmingly create a news landscape that favors soft news over hard news, which while entertaining does little to equip citizens to make informed decisions on public policy and social issues. Changes in communication technologies are, of course, changing the nature of news, and more recently we have witnessed the increasing political fragmentation of our news landscape, where commentary and opinion are replacing more traditional news outlets governed by the professional norm of objectivity.

Pragmatism

Of the perspectives we have discussed thus far, perhaps none are as explicitly concerned

with matters of governance as pragmatism. This approach to media focuses specifically on the relationship between government and media institutions, and even more narrowly on government regulation of media. Approaching the topic of regulation through the philosophical writings on American pragmatism affords a balanced assessment of consequences and contingencies (James 1978; Dewey 1958). All governmental regulations have material consequences, and media scholars operating from this perspective inquire into the pragmatic effects of regulation – be they oriented toward ownership or content – on commodities, consumers, and companies. In assessing such effects, consideration is given to key contingencies within the social system such as free speech and public interest. By striking a balanced assessment of consequences and contingencies, media scholars are better able to judge the relative social benefit or harm of various regulations.

Media scholarship on government regulation of the media has tended to focus on six categories, three of which are concerned with ownership and three concerned with content: combatting monopoly, protecting intellectual property, maintaining national interest, promoting diversity, managing morality, and ensuring accuracy. In each of these areas, context plays an important role, especially in the recognition that context changes. The continuous development of new communication technologies means that our regulatory environment is endlessly evolving as well. The rise and spread of digital and social media, for instance, has raised challenging questions about copyright, content providers vs. platforms, and accessibility among many others. Political scientists who want to understand our regulatory environment would do well to attend carefully to the ways communication technologies reaffirm and replicate their inherent social biases. This seems especially salient in a digital, networked world where so-called “social media” platforms are given to depersonalization, decontextualization, and disinformation.

Cultural studies

The perspective of cultural studies concentrates on how popular texts like film, television, and advertising help reinforce existing social power structures, especially as it relates to matters of class and race. A central aspect

of this tradition is the analysis of ideology, a system of shared understanding that unconsciously shapes and constrains an individual's beliefs and behaviors. Drawing on Pierre Bourdieu's (1977) notion of doxa and Antonio Gramsci's (2003) understanding of hegemony, among other concepts, scholars in this tradition contend that ideology helps enforce power structures in four ways. In its most basic form ideology *limits* the range of acceptable ideas that a person might consider, legitimizing certain perspectives and obscuring others. In doing so it also *normalizes* these "legitimate" understandings, making what is arbitrary seem natural, inevitable, and dominant. This naturalization, in turn, means that ideology *privileges* the interests of some social groups over others. Groups whose perspectives become dominant through the first two operations accrue greater prestige and power in the process. Finally, in its most developed form ideology *interpellates* members of a given culture, providing a select set of ideas from which individuals must draw their sense of identity or self-worth (Althusser 2001).

The cultural studies tradition is inescapably political in its purpose. Critics who analyse media through the lens of ideology attempt to challenge and eradicate structures of inequality and injustice. For example, scholars might identify how the plots of films like *The Social Network* (2010) or *The Founder* (2016) promote the ideology of the American Dream, encouraging audiences to identify and reject the core message as an unrealistic construct rather than accept it as a blueprint for living. Other scholars might analyse how print advertising routinely reinforces ideologies of white privilege by excluding models of color, including harmful stereotypes of racial minority groups, or constructing non-white populations as sources of exotic or exciting experiences for white consumers. The primary purpose of such scholarship would be to encourage readers of all races to realize and accept the artificiality of white privilege in order to begin dismantling its ideological dominance. As a result of this commitment, approaches to ideology in critical media studies might provide political scientists with nuanced tools for grappling with persistent social issues like income inequality, raising the minimum wage, racial discrimination in the workplace, or the mistreatment of communities of color by police.

Feminist Theory

Just as cultural studies lends itself to an analysis of class and race as axes of domination, a feminist approach to media analyses how aspects of popular culture help create and maintain sexist social systems. Despite the diversity of work in this tradition, which draws from both academic and popular thinkers (hooks 2000; Wolf 1991), a unifying thread involves challenging essentialist approaches to gender. Here essentialism refers to beliefs that culturally constructed norms of masculinity and femininity are as natural and inflexible as assumed biological distinctions between the sexes. Essentialism supports sexist discrimination by opening up a wide variety of otherwise irrelevant tastes and activities for judgment. Only if there is widespread sentiment that all women are inherently predisposed to excessive emotional displays, or that all men are naturally given to maintaining "a stiff upper lip," can emotion become a meaningful topic on which to decide the worth of individual women and men. Scholars operating from this vantage convincingly point out that the constructed gender norms of one age or cultural context often seem ridiculous to another. While it was a squarely masculine behavior for men to wear voluminous wigs and flamboyant garments in certain eighteenth-century Western societies, for instance, people in many countries today would not consider such practices to be identifiably masculine (Richardson and Wearing 2014, 1).

Even more specifically, feminist scholars identify how stereotypical representations of gender in media reflect and bolster systems of patriarchy, or the "logic" of sexist discrimination, where the interests of women and the value of femininity are subordinate to the interests of men and the value of masculinity. They might, for example, point out how long-running television programs like *The Simpsons* or *Family Guy* tend to feature male characters who work in the public sector and women who tend to domestic matters. They might also recognize how the film genre of sex comedies – from the *Porky's* series (1982–85) to *Superbad* (2007) – tends to position men as sexually pursuant and women as sexual objects to be captured. Collectively these works help normalize the sense that men should succeed economically and dominate sexually, while women should routinely forgo economic success and relent to men's sexual

demands. By challenging such representations as conventional rather than essential, feminist scholars help undermine the much larger network of arbitrary, unequal power relations that structures relations between men and women. As such, their work can provide useful perspective to political scientists on contemporary social concerns like unequal pay, intimate partner violence, or reproductive rights.

Queer theory

Much like feminism, the perspective of queer theory seeks to challenge received understandings of sex. Annamarie Jagose (1996) argues that the word “queer” broadly describes any behaviors, identities, or perceptions that “dramatize incoherence in the allegedly stable relations between chromosomal sex, gender, and sexual desire” (3). We might say, then, that queer theory expands the feminist political project to interrogate the artificial social construction of human sexuality. Central to this approach is an understanding of sexuality as either a discursive construction (Foucault 1990) or a performance (Butler 1999). In either case, scholars in this tradition contend that existing identity labels like gay, straight, heteroflexible, pansexual, or asexual are cultural constructs from which individuals draw meaning and ultimately bring order to their varied sexual desires and practices. The trade-off for such coherence is a relative reduction in the near-infinite diversity of human sexuality, as well as a system of power relations that privileges some sexual desires and practices over others (heteronormativity). As such, queer media scholars identify how popular works tend to represent desire with recourse to persistent and limiting stereotypes, but their fascination with the instability of these categories also means that they contemplate how representations sometimes inadvertently or surreptitiously signal the very fluidity of desire that they are meant to obscure.

An example of work in the first vein above might involve comparing the wealth of reality television dating programs that focus on male-female romance like *The Bachelor* and *The Bachelorette* against the paucity of shows that focus on same-sex coupling. Queer scholars could also analyse how even apparently progressive representations of sexual identities outside of mainstream heterosexuality

still contain troubling, heteronormative logics (such as a same-sex couple in a film that nevertheless embodies a traditional husband and wife dynamic). In both cases, heterosexuality appears normal and common, while other forms of sexuality appear deviant or in need of restraint. Scholarship in the second vein, by comparison, might contemplate how works without any overtly sexual content might nonetheless embody queer sensibilities like *camp*, a compositional logic that blends irony, theatricality, humor, and aestheticism in ways that mirror coping strategies by those who are not straight but who must live under the demands of heteronormativity (Babuscio 2004). Scholars might also scrutinize popular media franchises – such as the *X-Men* series of comics, films, and television shows – for the ways that these narratives encode queer desire, shame, oppression, and hope through veiled metaphors and other “textual winks” (Morris 1996) meant for queer audiences. These varied approaches suggest that the tools of queer media analysis might be useful for understanding all manner of contemporary political issues surrounding human sex and sexuality, from gay adoption to transgender rights.

Closing thoughts

As the preceding overview suggests, critical media studies is a diverse, multidisciplinary field of study interested in demythologizing and dismantling media institutions and depictions that create and perpetuate injustice and inequality (Ott and Mack, 2020). Its primary contribution to critical political science resides in its invitation to interrogate the complex ways that media, as technologies of communication, shape our social environment, which in turn privileges some forms of governance, political habits, and modes of thought over others.

BRIAN L. OTT AND ROBERT L. MACK

References

- Althusser, Louis. 2001. “Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes Toward an Investigation).” In *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, translated by Ben Brewster, 88–126. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Babuscio, Jack. 2004. “Camp and the Gay Sensibility.” In *Queer Cinema: The Film Reader*, edited by Harry Benshoff and Sean Griffin, 121–36. New York: Routledge.

- Bennett, W. Lance. 2016. *News: The Politics of Illusion*, 10th edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Butler, Judith. 1999. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, 10th Anniversary Edition. New York: Routledge.
- Cheney, George, Lars Thøger Christensen, Theodore E. Zorn Jr., and Shiv Ganesh. 2004. *Organizational Communication in an Age of Globalization: Issues, Reflections, Practices*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Dewey, James. 1958. *Experience and Nature*. Mineola, NY: Dover.
- Foucault, Michel. 1990. *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introduction*, translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage Books.
- Gramsci, Antonio. 2003. *Selections from The Prison Notebooks*, edited and translated by Quentin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. New York: International Publishers.
- hooks, bell. 2000. *Feminism is for Everybody: Passionate Politics*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Jagose, Annamarie. 1996. *Queer Theory: An Introduction*. New York: New York University Press.
- James, William. 1978. *Pragmatism and the Meaning of Truth*. Cambridge: Boston University Press.
- Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. 2004. *The Communist Manifesto*. London: Penguin.
- McLuhan, Marshal. 1962. *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Morris, Charles E. 2002. "Pink Herring and the Fourth Persona: J. Edgar Hoover's Sex Crime Panic." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 88, no. 2: 228–44.
- Ong, Walter. 1982. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. New York: Routledge.
- Ott, Brian L., and Robert L. Mack. 2020. *Critical Media Studies: An Introduction*, 3rd edition. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Richardson, Niall, and Sadie Wearing. 2014. *Gender in the Media*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wolf, Naomi. 1991. *The Beauty Myth*. New York: William Morrow and Company.

41. Critical film studies

Film studies as a discipline, rests on three legs: analysis of film as an industry; analysis of film texts; analysis of the contexts of reception. As a critical political science, the study of film must challenge dominant power complexes (hence be critical), must be connected in some way to broader movements of change challenging unequal distributions of power (hence be political) and must be a coherent, systematic mode of enquiry with established procedures and recognized methodologies (hence be a science). In fact, holding these three different strands together in a single enterprise has been quite difficult. For example, debates over methodological issues can often descend into highly specialized insular concerns that saw away at the connections a critical science has to those broader political movements and aims (Forsyth 1997). One of the attractions of film as a medium is precisely its connectedness to popular culture and mass audiences. We can then add a fourth leg to the discipline, and that is film practices themselves when they are self-consciously drawing on critical science disciplines, such as historiography, political science, ethnography, investigative journalism, or indeed film studies. This is distinguished from the analysis of film texts, which is the activity of film studies as a discipline, while film as a practice reminds us that film has a very much more interesting and active life outside the academy. In any critical mode of thought employing dialectical reasoning, the four legs are complexly intertwined but for the sake of clarity of exposition, we can analytically separate them.

The analysis of film as an industry and as a site of production that includes distribution and exhibition, draws on a number of key disciplines: political economy, historiography, cultural sociology, political science/history, and policy analysis. Political economy is crucial because film is a significant branch of manufacturing capitalism. Hollywood, which has dominated film globally ever since the rise of the studio system after the First World War, pioneered vertical integration of production, distribution and exhibition, the centralization and concentration of ownership, the related fusion with finance capital (the banking system) and harnessed the enthusiastic backing of the US superpower state,

which recognized the spin off benefits of breaking down protectionist film policies of other nation states (Hollywood helped sell both American goods and American ideals). As a commodity, film has a “central position ... in mass-mediated cultural life” (Jowett and Linton 1980, 20), not only in terms of its high profile but through the synergies it creates with books, merchandise, records, comics, radio, television, theatre, amusement parks, computer games, and so on. This cultural-commodity-intertextuality is promoted by corporate structures with interests across the entertainment sector (hardware as well as content production) and sometimes well beyond entertainment and communication altogether. What the impact of corporate control may be on the film product is a complex and contested area of debate. Tendencies towards commodification are of course rife, see for example Wasko (2003) and Mehan (2015). But it is also clear that corporate power remains dependent on the qualitative decision-making of creative labor power (Wayne 2020). The cultural sociology of “production studies” explores the complex negotiations around control and authorship even in the most highly capitalized film industries (Caldwell 2008; Banks, Conor, Mayer 2015) while outside the core of the Hollywood complex or other corporate capitals, artisanal modes of production continue in film as in other cultural industries (Garnham 1979, 139; Hesmondhalgh 2002) for the very good reason that capital cannot create ideas (Enzensberger 1982, 5). The tensions and overlaps between capital and creative talent in the film industry have been there from the very beginning, evident in the formation of United Artists in 1919 for example by Mary Pickford, Douglas Fairbanks, Charlie Chaplin, and D.W. Griffith (Bach 1985).

Critical thinking has had to grasp two simultaneous tendencies in film production. Firstly, the tendency towards the centralization and concentration of capital, which in its latest phase sees electronic communication subsumed under transnational corporate control or what has become popularly known as “digital capitalism” (Schiller 1999; Fuchs and Mosco 2017). AT&T’s takeover of Warner Media in 2018 is exemplary of this trend in the film sector as a big electronic communications infrastructure company seeks content for their distribution systems. The growth of Netflix using internet dis-

tribution as a way of accessing audiences without ever having to buy a cinema chain is another example of new trends combined with old continuities (Netflix's institutional investors include significant corporations in finance capitalism). But this centralization and concentration of capital is coupled with the tendency towards cultural differentiation via complex organizational transnational structures involving "post-Fordist" networks of subsidiaries and subcontractors (Askoy and Robbins 1992; Wayne 2003). Although in this way cultural difference has been accommodated in the organizational logic of corporate structures in a way not foreseen by earlier critics of the "culture industry" (Adorno and Horkheimer 1973) with its standardizing logic, this has not diffused the century-long demands to protect national cinemas and regional cultures above and below the nation-state from Hollywood's control over markets and audiences. Critical political economy thus necessarily shades into policy analysis, assessing the struggle (or absence of struggle) to mobilize state defense mechanisms that can sustain film's contribution to telling stories that are authentic products of "local" popular experience and that can be exchanged and circulated fairly for international audiences (Moran 1996).

The mix and combination of disciplines studying the field of production is necessary to challenge the concentration of political and class-economic power around capital and state. Power is multifaceted and interconnected and tracing the relationships between for example political power and class-economic power reveals the interests served and concealed by myths of the "free market" and consumer sovereignty. Critical political science in this area must connect macro analysis of power structures with micro analysis of the complexity of how power is exerted, internalized and contested by various kinds of social agents, using frameworks that have combined the mapping of power and the complexity of power, as in the work of Gramsci and Bourdieu for example (Burawoy 2019) or Mosco's use of the agential appropriation of structures that Giddens calls "structuration" (Mosco 2009).

The second leg, which can obviously be combined with any of the disciplines from the first, is an analysis of what it is that the industry produces, the films themselves. Here film studies departs significantly from the quan-

titative traditions of analysis associated with the social and political sciences. Quantitative content analysis of the media (especially the news media) dominates the scholarly literature in that discipline. In film studies there certainly exist quantitative content analysis based on developing a code book and assigning semantic units to be measured by frequency and combination. Journal articles of this type are likely to be published in social science publications. However, film studies as a distinct discipline has been shaped by broader cultural considerations of the medium as an art form and this has meant that by far the dominant approaches to the study of film are qualitative, rather than quantitative, because the former are more sensitive to the communicative complexity of the medium. Prior to the widespread consolidation of film studies in academia, writers on the medium came to it through the lens of art history, cultural commentary, philosophy, historiography, and a sociological appreciation of symbolism in film (for example, Bazin 2005 and Warshaw 2001).

As film studies established itself on university curricula in the 1960s, the key question was less "content," understood as a measurable unit of analysis, than the specificity of the formal qualities of the medium. Initially this was tied to discovering film "auteurs" (authors) through the analysis of the stylistic and thematic unities and continuities to be observed in the work of film directors across a body of films. This was obviously at some level a bid to cement the artistic validity of the medium for serious study and appreciation, despite its industrial mode of production. While this approach was subsequently challenged for frequently bracketing off the collaborative and contextual dimensions of the auteurs, the approach did cultivate close and systematic readings of texts, a method pioneered by the influential literary critic F.R. Leavis (see for example Wood 2008). Yet auteur analysis could also be combined with historical and political analysis (Turvey 1982) and critical analysis has found that authorship (which may be shared across any number of creative roles) cannot really be extinguished no matter the extent of the structural constraints and contexts. Questions of agency are ineliminable.

However, the more romantic and idealist versions of authorship were quite rapidly challenged and displaced as structural-

ist, semiotic and post-structuralist analysis gained ground and the focus shifted to genre and narrative analysis overlaid with debates around ideology, realism, the construction of subjectivity, and national cinemas. Key journals from the mid-1960s onwards included *Cahiers Du Cinema*, which after the events of May 1968 in France, shifted decisively towards Marxism; *Screen* the British journal which undertook to translate French and continental theory into English language Film Studies to challenge traditional empirical assumptions and the American journal *Jump Cut*, which specialized in applying new theoretical perspectives to popular culture.

A key concern for a critical political science of film studies remains paying due attention to the socio-economic process and broader contexts of production on the one hand and the films themselves as “relatively autonomous” generators of textual pleasures and meanings on the other (Hill 1979). One methodological approach is to focus on the imperative for both standardization and product differentiation within film industries, which, when coupled with historicist analysis, can infer how industry pressures and producer/director strategies influence film texts (Staiger 1981; Higson 1997). The analysis of film form was also politicized by drawing on frameworks that were connected to wider movements for political change, such as Marxist, Feminist, Gay, Lesbian, and Black struggles. Such critical frameworks brought methodological innovations to the study of film. For example, the Feminist and queer critique of the sexual dynamics of looking and objectification in the cinema (Dyer 1993) or the contribution that Marxism taught (especially via literary theory) about the need to explore contradictions within texts rather than assume the normative superiority of unities, as with bourgeois aesthetic criterion (Klinger 1984). Such frameworks also mounted a critique of the dominant systems of representation of various social groups as part of wider inequalities of power in society (as with the analysis of race, gender, or class in film culture) and explicitly or implicitly advocated change. In fact this strand of film studies, questioning representations of social groups, has arguably had the biggest public and policy impact on the industry and wider attitudes.

When thinking about film studies as a critical political science, it is best to remember

that this is a normative ideal as much as it is a description of what actually takes place. But it is also a contested ideal as well, around the question of what constitutes critical research. For much film studies, the question of impinging determinations beyond the text are often quite gestural at best. Several decades of developing the hermeneutic tools for analysing texts (in film and other disciplines) has lifted the general cultural level of “readings” to unprecedented heights of sophistication. A recent trend of discussing film in relation to the works of key philosophers has seen a new resurgence of text-focused criticism (for example Fraser 2018) with all the strengths and weaknesses which that brings. A concern about text-focused criticism bracketing off the issues of production and political economy was somewhat tributary in film studies. The trajectory away from text-focused criticism was motivated primarily by a desire to engage with audiences, as opposed to the “spectator” or implied and ideal position (typically equated with ideology) offered by texts. Reception studies brought new methodologies into play for the study of film, including ethnography (Walkerdine 1990), focus groups (Anderson 2011) qualitative interviews (Anderson 2012), survey methods (Barker and Mathijs 2008; Monk 2011), and memory studies (Kuhn 2002), as well as the aforementioned textual and historicist methodologies, on the basis that “[c]ontexts of social formations ... explain the interpretive strategies and affective responses of readers” (Staiger 1992, 89). In engaging with real audiences, the diversity of ways in which audiences made sense of the products of the film industry could be explored and significantly nuance some of the abstract evaluations of texts offered from an industry or textual perspective. Nonetheless, it remains a methodological imperative for any *critical* political science of film, that this diversity and sense of agency is not bought at the expense of a loss of interest in how audience experiences are shaped by both industry determinants and broader inequalities of social, economic, political, and cultural resources (Garnham 1997).

One reason why it is worth distinguishing between the disciplinary analysis of films and film practices, is that filmmakers themselves have been a considerable source of intelligent writing about the medium, typically as they reflect on their own experiences and craft.

The Soviet filmmakers of the 1920s made pioneering contributions on this front, especially Lev Kuleshov (1974), Sergei Eisenstein (1998), and Vsevolod Pudovkin (1954). In the 1960s a new wave of Latin American filmmakers engaged with the pan-continental struggles against imperialism, and like the Soviets, considered reflective enquiry into their practice, essential (Martin 1997). Filmmakers have also produced important manifestoes that have signaled demands for change in filmmaking practices, such as Guy Debord's "Prolegomena For All Future Cinema" which publicized and anticipated new Lettriste and Situationist cinema, the Free Cinema Manifesto that helped promote a new wave of British filmmakers in the late 1950s, the Oberhausen Manifesto in the 1960s that helped clear the way for the German New Wave, or the 1995 DOGMA manifesto that declared war on the commercial model of filmmaking (MacKenzie 2014). Film Studies certainly influences film practices (by churning out graduates in the discipline who go on into the industry, by informing broader public discussions, such as on the question of representation of various social groups, and via the more experimental and self-reflexive modes of film practice, such as the essay film). However, the primary relationship is that film studies is dependent on film practices and the latter has its roots in the vital currents of social, economic, political, and cultural life well beyond the confines of film analysis. Certain kinds of films are moreover a type of critical science through film practice (rather than film studies). This is very evident in the documentary film genre for example, but can also be seen in certain kinds of fictional filmmaking with clear pedagogic purposes. Two films by Göran Olsson, *The Black Power Mixtape 1967–1975* (2011) and *Concerning Violence* (2014), and two by Adam McKay, *The Big Short* (2015) and *Vice* (2018), may stand as examples of the two genres doing the work of critical political science. In the last analysis, as in all questions around the relationship between theory and practice, the critical potential of film studies rests on the critical potential of film practice.

MICHAEL WAYNE

References

- Adorno, Theodor and Max Horkheimer. 1973. *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, translated by Allen Lane. New York: Continuum Press.
- Anderson, Lauren. 2011. "Dancing About Architecture? Talking Around popular Music in Film Soundtracks." *Participations: Journal of Audience and Reception Studies* 8, no. 1 (May): 188–215.
- Anderson, Lauren. 2012. "'That's How It's Supposed to Make You Feel': Talking with Audiences about *Both Sides No* and *Live Actually*." *Participations: Journal of Audience and Reception Studies* 9, no. 2 (November): 206–38.
- Askoy, Asu and Keven Robbins. 1992. "Hollywood for the 21st Century: Global Competition for Critical Mass in Image Markets." *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 16, no. 1: 1–22.
- Bach, Steven. 1985. *Final Cut: Dreams and Disaster in the Making of Heaven's Gate, The Film that Sank United Artists*. New York: Newmarket Press.
- Banks, Miranda, Bridget Conor, and Viki Mayer. 2015. *Production Studies, the Sequel!* New York: Routledge.
- Barker, Martin and Ernest Mathijs. 2008. *Watching Lord of the Rings, Tolkein's World Audiences*. New York: International Academic Publishers.
- Bazin, A. 2005. *What is Cinema?* Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Burawoy, M. 2019. *Symbolic Violence, Conversations with Bourdieu*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Caldwell, John T. 2008. *Production Culture: Industrial Reflexivity and Critical Practice in Film and Television*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Dyer, Richard. 1993. *The Matter of Images*. New York: Routledge.
- Eisenstein, Sergei. 1998. *The Eisenstein Reader*, edited by Richard Taylor; translated by Richard Taylor and William Powell. London: British Film Institute.
- Enzensberger, H.M. 1982. *Critical Essays*, edited by Reinhold Grimm and Bruce Armstrong. New York: Continuum.
- Forsyth, Scott. 1997. "Marxism, Film and Theory: From the Barricades to Postmodernism." In *Socialist Register*, edited by Leo Panitch, 265–87. London: Merlin Press.
- Fraser, I. 2018. *Political Theory and Film, From Adorno to Žižek*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Fuchs, Christian and Vincent Mosco. 2017. *Marx in the Age of Digital Capitalism*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.
- Garnham, Nicholas. 1979. "Contribution to a Political Economy of Mass-Communication." *Media, Culture and Society* 1, no. 1: 123–46.

- Garnham, Nicholas. 1997. "Political Economy and the Practice of Cultural Studies." In *Cultural Studies in Question*, edited by Marjorie Ferguson and Peter Golding, 56–74. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hesmondhalgh, David. 2002. *The Cultural Industries*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Higson, A. 1997. *Waving the Flag*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hill, J. 1979. "Ideology, Economy and the British Cinema." In *Ideology and Cultural Production*, edited by M. Barrett, 112–34. London: Croom Helm.
- Klinger, Barbara. 1984. "'Cinema/Ideology/Criticism' Revisited: The Progressive Text." *Screen* 25, no. 1: 30–44.
- Kuhn, Annette. 2002. *An Everyday Magic, Cinema and Cultural Memory*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Kulesov, Lev. 1974. *Kulesov on Film*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- MacKenzie, Scott. 2014. *Film Manifestos and Global Cinema Cultures: A Critical Anthology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Martin, Michael T. 1997. *New Latin American Cinema, Theory, Practices, and Transcontinental Articulations*, Vol. 1. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Meehan, E.R. 2015. "'Holy Commodity Fetish, Batman!' The Political Economy of a Commercial Intertext." In *Many More Lives of Batman*, edited by Roberta Pearson, William Uricchio and Will Brooker, 69–87. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Monk, Claire. 2011. *Heritage Film Audiences, Period Films and Contemporary Audiences in the UK*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Moran, Albert. 1996. *Film Policy, International, National and Regional Perspectives*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Mosco, Vincent. 2009. *The Political Economy of Communication*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Pudovkin, Vsevolod. 1954. *Film Technique and Film Acting*. London: Vision Press.
- Schiller, Dan. 1999. *Digital Capitalism: Networking the Global Market System*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.
- Staiger, Janet. 1981. "Mass Produced Photoplays: Economic and Signifying Practices in the First Years of Hollywood." *Wide Angle* 4, no. 2: 12–27.
- Staiger, Janet. 1992. "Film, Reception, and Cultural Studies." *The Centennial Review* 36, no. 1: 89–104.
- Turvey, Gerry. 1982. "1936, The Culture of the Popular Front and Jean Renoir." *Media Culture and Society* 4, no. 4: 339–59.
- Walkerdine, Valerie. 1990. *Schoolgirl Fictions*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Warshow, R. 2001. *The Immediate Experience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wasko, Janet. 2003. *How Hollywood Works*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Wayne, Mike. 2003. "Post Fordism, Monopoly Capitalism and Hollywood's Media Industrial Complex." *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 6, no. 1: 82–103.
- Wayne, Mike. 2020. *Marxism Goes to the Movies*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Wood, Robin. 2008. *Hitchcock's Films Revisited*. New York: Columbia University Press.

See also

Art; Music; Literary Criticism; Ideology Critique; Reification

42. Literary criticism I

The relationship between literary criticism and the critical science of politics shifts based on history and politics. Literature and criticism often openly link to politics, and often literary critics denounce such linkage as un-literary, either for the alleged mistake of confusing aesthetics with journalism, or for unsophisticated reading strategies that treat literature as the world, often leading to crude art or simplistic interpretations of complicated works. Yet strangely, politics and history tend to resurface, however banished by the aesthete or the sophisticate. We can expect such debates to intensify in the future.

Political criticism articulates strategies of political art and modes of political reading that challenge traditional criticism that allegedly dedicates itself to pure aestheticism, untampered by worldly concerns. But for a modern literary criticism consciously connected to politics, Karl Marx and the traditions of historical materialism grow more relevant with time. We hover on the brink of another epoch with intense class struggle; therefore, this entry will, very briefly, describe a few key moments in the history of thinking on culture while stressing the classic period of Marxism, the moment in which Marxism as a political movement was established and fought for power, yet remained committed to culture as an end in itself. Therefore, I highlight aspects of the critical practice of the four most significant figures in classical Marxism: Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Trotsky (see Eagleton 1996; Anshen 2017).

Historically, on the surface there might appear to be a cyclical pattern between art produced as pure aestheticism and the appearance of “committed art” that overtly serves political objectives. However, these shifts and oscillations in literary attitudes do not take place mechanically but instead reflect political and social conflicts – in sometimes obvious and sometimes complex manners. Not surprisingly when class struggle and social conflict intensifies, appeals for disinterested aesthetics gain fewer adherents. Conversely, when society seems stable and change seems blocked, politics becomes anathema to aesthetics, or aesthetics substitutes for politics, and categories such as what Kant calls “the beautiful” and “the sublime” produced by artistic “genius” understood as

“disinterested ... free” judgements separate from any interests or extra-artistic considerations, come to the fore (Kant 2018, 425–46). This repeated split in the dominant function of literature and its criticism takes place with politics and through politics, and critics prioritize “delight” as the purpose of literature, ignoring the radical idea, first articulated by the Roman critic Horace, that art can both “instruct *and* delight” (Horace 2018, 133–44), an idea later adapted by the German Marxist playwright and theorist Bertolt Brecht. The persistence of class struggle and political tensions consistently undercuts repeated efforts across the history of criticism and literary theory to sever art from society permanently, despite constant variations of Victorian British critic Matthew Arnold’s conviction (among others) that criticism should remain “disinterested” (Arnold 2018, 692), by which Arnold (2018, 702), like Kant, means “aloof” from the “practical view of things,” and that critics and intelligent readers should strive for experiencing the “best” that has been “known and thought” from the pinnacles of world literature and culture.

In the contemporary world of massive disorder including the pandemic and constant economic crises, social and cultural conflicts become more polarized and not surprisingly appeals for abstract, depoliticized “art for art’s sake” find fewer champions than during more sanguine times. Yet, however pleasurable, legitimate, and inherently fascinating aesthetic contemplation remains, in times of social crisis neutrality becomes less desirable. For example, the rage for “the pleasure of the text,” an approach developed by literary critic Roland Barthes (Barthes 2011) that connects hedonism to the play of language and its ambiguities, seems less powerful and less appealing for students and scholars now than Barthes’ earlier political deconstruction of social practices as capitalist myths in his *Mythologies* (Barthes 2016).

The recent slow, but real, uptick in the class struggle comes after decades of relative quiescence as capitalist social crises deflate the “cultural logic” of postmodernism with claims that imply an “incredulity” to systematic critique and the end of “metanarratives” by poststructuralist and former Marxist, Francois Lyotard (Lyotard 1997). Such absolute prescriptions on critical politics seem grossly exaggerated. Indeed, an expectation that Marxism must once again

become a mass political possibility as life becomes dystopic seems reasonable. And if so, literary criticism will, due to events, once again turn to Marxism as an intellectual necessity and Marxist literary theory and criticism will, once again, attain influence as a part of a critical political science aimed at combining analysis with practical activity as part of the fight for a socialist future.

To illustrate the interrelation between politics and literary criticism we might note that its nature has been debated throughout history, including prior to capitalism. One might begin a quick overview by noting the contentious politics of poetics in ancient Greek society, which famously turns on opposing claims about the politics and ethics of art held by Plato, who condemns art in the name of a rational and just society, banishing it from his Republic. Aristotle, by contrast, champions artistic representations as more “philosophical” than history since the latter limits itself to chronicling events rather than interrogating them. Or one might consider the German idealists from Kant through Hegel who respond to the contradictions of the French Revolution to accord new redemptive values to the arts. These new claims for art and its importance come to birth in reaction to the French Revolution, with its dream of a just society. As the revolution declined, new redemptive compensatory powers became ascribed to art.

Marx and Engels

In some ways, Marx and Engels wrote little to nothing directly about literature, although they peppered their writings with constant allusions, references, and literary illustrations. For example, *Capital* references Robinson Crusoe and the biblical “Mark of the Beast” early on; *The Holy Family*, an early joint work of the two, spends quite a bit of time dismantling the otherwise forgotten novels of Eugene Sue. Marx himself, as a young man, wrote Romantic epic poetry, held by most (but not all) to be worthless, and Engels and Marx claim to have learned more about French economics from the great French reactionary novelist Balzac than French economic historians when preparing *Capital*. However, the things they did write concerning literature merit careful attention, particularly since, interestingly, they challenge standard ideas of Marxist literary crit-

icism and historical materialism, particularly Stalinist and Maoist prescriptivism towards the arts, but also facile liberal and false interpretations of Marxism that reduce Marx’s thought to fatalistic economic determinism.

In Marx’s notebooks, the *Grundrisse*, Marx scribbled a section sometimes anthologized as “On Greek Art” that considers the historical nature of Greek production of the arts (Marx 1973). But Marx came to conclusions that might surprise those who buy into simplistic interpretations of Marxism. Marx begins by exploring Greek art in relation to historical materialism, briefly defined as the view that the unfolding of history can be rationally understood as a product of the contradictions of an existing economic system leading to class struggle. Historical materialism stresses economic developments in technology (Marx’s “forces of production”) and class structure (Marx’s “relations of production”) as determinants of history, ideas, culture, and the nature of society, in contrast to idealist claims for the purely ideal nature of concepts. And for historical materialism these material economic relations and class divisions determine the nature of the “ideas” and “conceptions” within which the class struggle unfolds, as described in *The Communist Manifesto* (Marx 2009).

Marx stresses the historical and social determinants of Greek art. As he writes, “the difficulty lies not in understanding that the Greek art and epic are bound up with certain forms of social development. The difficulty is that they still afford us artistic pleasure and that in a certain respect they count as a norm and an unattainable idea” (Marx 1973, 111). In this statement, Marx articulates his historical materialism that “art” remains “bound up with certain forms of social development” (110), before quickly taking art appreciation out of its historical context. Marx (1973, 110) stresses that while definite social relations do shape the creation of art, in modern times even though we exist outside of those conditions we still hold Greek art up as an “unattainable ideal.” For Marx, to show that forms of art remain determined by their historical conditions of production does not suggest that the human imagination remains linked in a narrow, rigid, or automatic way to hermetically sealed stages of historical development. Marx moves his analysis from a preliminary investigation of the roots of Greek art, the determinations of Greek art

within a precise context, to marveling at and attempting to explain its ongoing appeal. Earlier in the essay Marx (1973, 110) states the problem in a different manner: "It is well known that Greek mythology is not only the arsenal of Greek art but also its foundation. Is the view of nature and social relations on which the Greek imagination and hence Greek [mythology] is based possible with self-acting mule spindles and railways and locomotives?" Here, Marx problematizes any simple one-to-one relationship between what he refers to as the economic "base" and levels of artistic quality, value, or appeal. Marx (1973, 110) asks if "all mythology ... shapes and dominates" the "forces of nature" through the "imagination," should it not become obsolete after the "real mastery over" those same "forces of nature." This suggests that as the power of "railways," "locomotives," and "electrical telegraphs" allows humanity to master nature, the values and interest in Greek mythic art should diminish until eliminated. Since that clearly did not happen and Greek art remains central in the European canon, Marx (1973, 111) speculates that these outdated works remain an "unattainable model."

Marx (1973, 110–11) concludes with the point that the "charm" of Greek art lies precisely in its differences from modern society. He argues that no "contradiction" exists between the "undeveloped stage of society," but derives instead from the "social conditions under which it arose" that "can never return." This requires a bit of thought since it differs so widely from standard understanding of Marxist cultural theory, which usually focuses, at times quite narrowly, on the realism of art. Instead of remaining with the thought that the value of Greek art derives from its proximity to real-life conditions, Marx makes the opposite point, namely that precisely the distance from current conditions allows the artwork to escape its historical cage and draw upon alternative, imaginative realities. This makes sense of the continuing and almost timeless appeal of two seemingly timeless literary genres, the imaginative historical narrative and science fiction, fantasy, and various utopian imaginings. Marx ascribes a unique role to fiction: a means to escape social prejudices and the narrow limits of existing life. Marx's observations also

bridge smoothly to Freud's claim that art, like dreams, fantasies, and religion, allow imaginary wish fulfilment and the satisfaction of otherwise unattainable desires.

Engels wrote about literature primarily in his correspondence with writers and revolutionaries. Most famous of these letters and formulations include Engels stressing the dangers of economic reductionism with a famous clarification of the misunderstandings by enemies – or confused friends – of how historical materialism works. Engels writes, "According to the materialist conception of history, the *ultimately* determining factor in history is the production ... of real life ... if someone twists this into ... the economic factor is the *only* determining one, he translates that proposition into a meaningless, abstract, absurd phrase" (italics in original; Eagleton 1996, 39).

Another major contribution Engels offers comes in a letter he wrote to his contemporary, the writer Margaret Harkness. He praises her writing despite finding that her novel gives an unrealistic account of working-class struggle by seeing the "working class figures as a passive mass" (Eagleton 1996, 40). From this, Engels champions literature that rather than viewing workers and the oppressed as victims, stresses their capacities to struggle and heroically to transform the world.

However, Engels also directly challenges commonly held views concerning the nature of Marxism and literature and reveals just how far authentic Marxism stands in opposition to the criminal aesthetic policies in the Stalinist Soviet Union, where one obeyed the mandates of so-called "socialist realism" on penalty of death, or the barbaric atrocities against humans and social culture under the so-called "Cultural Revolution" of Mao and his gang of self-serving bureaucrats. Engels states point blank to Harkness: "I am far from finding fault with your not having written a point-blank socialist novel ... The more the opinions of the author remain hidden, the better for the work of art" (Eagleton 1996, 40). The idea that art should devolve into didactic propaganda where overt, simplistic political lessons should be articulated in simple fashion, the hallmarks of Stalin and Mao's cultural polices, clearly finds opposition from no less a Marxist than Engels.

Lenin, Trotsky, and classical Marxism

The first half of the twentieth century reverberated with inter-imperialist conflict and increasingly strident battles between the classes on a world scale. Out of this, the next burst of Marxism developed in, and around, the Russian Revolution. Once again, the focus was to forge mass communist parties and the struggles dictated largely practical concerns. Nevertheless, the two major Marxists of the Bolshevik revolution, Lenin and Trotsky, wrote literary criticism that both remains influential in Marxist circles today and that stand, once again, in contrast to the brutally instrumental ways Stalinism and its Maoist form controlled and strangled culture in the name of communism.

Lenin wrote a series of articles praising and offering explanation of the well-known Leo Tolstoy, one of the world's most significant and greatest novelists, offering readings citing passages from *Anna Karenina* to illustrate the contradictory and "vividly expressed" nature of the period of the emancipation of the peasants from serfdom and the beginning stages of development of capitalist relations in the countryside from 1861 until 1905. Lenin, by way of praise, notes Tolstoy's extremely contradictory worldview, as expressed in his writings, which illuminate the real-world conditions emerging in Russia as class relations shifted widely. Tolstoy serves as a "mirror" of Russian society but one distorted because that society remained torn between modern capitalist relations, the newly emerging but increasingly significant workers' and peasants' socialist movements, and the intransigent remnants of feudal political, social, and economic institutions.

Lenin stresses the artistic greatness of Tolstoy as not due to his accurate understanding of society but rather for expressing its contradictions. Just as Marx praises Greek art for its untimeliness that reveals our present, Lenin praises Tolstoy for his embrace of a peasant ideology determined not by coherence, but by its inconsistencies. Tolstoy, in Lenin's reading, allows an analysis of Russia's past, from the vantage point of its distance from the present. Lenin writes that "critical elements in Tolstoy's doctrine might at times have been of practical value ... in spite of its reactionary and utopian features" at the end of the nineteenth century, but "in

our days" for Lenin there has been an "end to ... quiescence" because of historical development and class struggle. Lenin argues that Tolstoy's views align with a class and historical moment that were already surpassed by economic and political developments by the time of Lenin's writing.

Later, in the generation of the 1960s, Lenin's texts were reread by academics, allowing for new types of reading protocols. Since the linguistic turn initiated by the reception of the important structuralist linguist Ferdinand de Saussure stresses the arbitrary, fragmented, structural, and inherently inconsistent nature of language, the critics most suspicious of the romantic, bourgeois humanist, and naïve reflectionist traditions of literary criticism went, somewhat unexpectedly, back to Lenin and his texts on Tolstoy, often through the fascinating approach of the influential student of the new French Marxist philosopher Louis Althusser, Pierre Macherey, in his influential work, *A Theory of Literary Production* (2006). They stress the value of reading "symptomatically," which means discovering the contradictions within a text that point to the limitations of the author(s) or textual ideology (Macherey 2006). Macherey and colleagues claimed Lenin's authority in their project integrating the influence of new trends in literary theory such as "structuralism" and "deconstruction," which challenge previous literary assumptions that the best literature creates unity and beauty that form an organic whole. If Lenin praises contradictions as the road to truth when reading Tolstoy, these critics tended to read all literature based on contradictions, perceiving the gaps in the art-object as the way out of dominant world views.

The most significant contributor to a classical Marxist approach to literature and criticism, Leon Trotsky, often receives scant attention unrelated to the acuity and perception of his analyses for extra-literary, political reasons. After Trotsky's political defeat by the forces of Stalinism, Trotsky's writings became anathema and therefore unread by many who considered themselves Marxists. However, within the classical Marxist framework, no figure wrote more about literature and culture explicitly, both as a leader of the Russian revolution and after his exile, as he strove to rebuild a communist movement from the betrayals of Stalinism worldwide. From reading French novels on his train jour-

neys to build and strengthen the Red Army during the Civil War, to his Manifestos with the Surrealists in Mexico, Trotsky, sometimes known as “The Pen” for his writing power, remained a true lover of literature, often regretting that politics required his major attention limiting his literary endeavors.

As a central leader of the communist team around Lenin, Trotsky polemicized (through debate, not repression) with leaders of aesthetic movements such as Futurism (Trotsky 1960) and with the literary critical approach known as Formalism (Trotsky 1960). In both cases, Trotsky’s polemics with and about the great Modernist poets and artists of his time and his criticisms of Formalism, Trotsky’s approach remained temperate and, unlike later Stalinist developments, were based on attempts to respectfully advance criticisms with no shade of repression or terror. Trotsky powerfully challenged the assumptions of both schools, particularly their claims for exclusive authority as the avant-garde or dominant schools of artistic production and artistic criticism, respectively.

Trotsky also wrote perceptive and acute analyses of major writers of his time and beyond including Jack London, Bernard Shaw, Andre Malraux, Ignazio Silone, Celine (whom Trotsky saw as heading towards fascism even before Celine realized his own political framework), and many others. Given the intensely political conditions in which Trotsky lived, he focused on all aspects of revolutionary politics and linked these to art in significant ways. His 1923 article, “Vodka, the Church, and the Cinema,” stresses the interconnection between pleasures and politics and remains largely political with concern for their mutual necessity. He writes:

The longing for amusement, distraction, sight-seeing, and laughter is the most legitimate desire of human nature. We are able ... to give the satisfaction of this desire a higher artistic quality, at the same time making amusement a weapon of collective education ... The most important weapon ... is at present the cinema. This ... innovation has cut into human life with a successful rapidity never experienced in the past. In the daily life of capitalist towns, the cinema has become just such an integral part of life as the bath, the beer-hall, the church, and other indispensable institutions, commendable and otherwise. The passion for the cinema is rooted in the desire for distraction, the desire

to see something new and improbable, to laugh and to cry. (Trotsky 2000 [1923] 32)

In this remarkable and often ignored essay, Trotsky links the pleasures of art with raising the morale, class-consciousness, and cultural level of the working class while challenging aspects of the old society and its opiates, the Church and the Tavern. The goal is not “moralizing,” depoliticized fun, or indoctrination. Rather Trotsky remains convinced that freedom and pleasure remain inextricably linked, but not all pleasures are equal in the construction of a new world.

DAVID ANSHEN

References

- Arnold, Matthew. 2018. “The Function of Criticism at the Present Time.” In *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, 692–702. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Anshen, David. 2017. *Marxist Literary and Cultural Theory*. Hyderabad, Telangana, India: Orient Blackswan Private Limited.
- Barthes, Roland. 2013. *Mythologies: The Complete Addition*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Barthes, Roland. 2011. *The Pleasure of the Text*. Brighton: Vernacular Publications.
- Eagleton, Terry and Drew Milne. 1996. *Marxist Literary Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Golden, Leon. 1968. *Aristotle’s Poetics*. Prentice-Hall.
- Jameson, Fredric. 1991. *Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Kant, Immanuel. 2018. “Critique of Judgement.” In *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, 425–64. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Lenin, V.I. 1996. “Leo Tolstoy and His Epoch.” In *Marxist Literary Theory*, edited by Terry Eagleton and Drew Milne, 42–44. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996.
- Lytard, Jean Francois. 1997. *The Postmodern Condition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Macherey, Pierre. 2015. *Theory of Literary Production*. New York: Routledge.
- Marx, Karl, and Ben Fowkes. 1990. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. Harmondsworth: Penguin in association with New Left Review.
- Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. 2009. *Communist Manifesto*. New York: Pathfinder.
- Marx, Karl. 1973. *Grundrisse*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Rosen, Stanley. 2008. *Plato’s Republic: A Study*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Schiller, Friedrich Von. 2018. “On the Aesthetic

- Education of Man.” In *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, 492–504. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Trotsky, Leon. 1972. *Art and Revolution: Writings on Literature, Politics and Culture*. New York: Pathfinder.
- Trotsky, Leon. 1960. *Literature and Revolution*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Trotsky, Leon. 2000 [1923]. “Vodka, the Church, and the Cinema.” In *Problems of Everyday Life: Creating the Foundations for a New Society in Revolutionary Russia*. New York: Pathfinder.

43. Literary criticism II

Literary criticism has acquired a reputation as a formal, textual analysis uninfluenced by “external” political matters. Criticism has defended its formal textual autonomy since the extensive growth of the university in the 1950s and 1960s, when literature was first established as a field of study in academia. However, a number of methodologies, including realism, Marxism, feminism, and black studies have each introduced politics into literary criticism.

Autonomous texts and authorial intention

Consider, for example, the New Criticism led by Cleanth Brooks, which emphasized close textual analysis and precluded politics from any consideration. This approach dominated academic literary criticism in the 1940s and 1950s, when the university accommodated only a small number of middle-class students. Methodologically, an influential faith in close textual analysis justified the growing specialization of literary study, but once the model of the research university was established in the United States, literary criticism divided into specialized fields of study opposed to the neo-classical methods of the older generalist scholars (Jancovich 1993, 10–12). Nevertheless, literary criticism did not escape politics. The new literary critics supported the Southern Agrarian movement and the modernist avant-garde, while condemning the “progress,” industry, liberalism, science, wealth, bureaucracy, and democratic equality of the Yankee North (Jancovich 1993, 71–101).

Other critics engaged in an analysis of the author’s intentions, rather than in close textual analysis, but they also consider analyses of the author’s intentions independent of politics. For example, E. D. Hirsch, Jr. (1976, 4–6, 45–9), favors a cognitive, generic view of the literary text, not the formal view of the New Critics. Simply stated, this view says that a text refers to, or “intends,” an ideal object. To perceive the object, the critic assumes that the text does not “intend” particular individuals or specific acts; it “brackets” such specifics and seeks the universal types behind them. For example, *Gulliver’s Travels* satirizes typical politicians or characteristic polit-

ical corruption, not Prime Minister Walpole or eighteenth-century British parliaments.

Literature and class

However, critics have argued that the construction of intention is not an unbiased act. On the contrary, in so far as the intention expresses a literary type or genre, it has socio-political import. For example, Georg Lukács claims that an artist who constructs a realist work reveals an intention whose political import lies in its critique of social life. Drawing on the Hegelian notion of totality and the Marxist notion of historical materialism, Lukács argues that realist art critiques the writer’s socio-historical context, revealing its limits and contradictions. Lukács ranks Balzac, Tolstoy, and other classical realists among the greatest writers because these realists overcame their ideological biases and grasp the naked “objective” truth that brutal exploitation, callous greed, and self-serving apology infest capitalist society. In Lukács’ (1950) famous example, Tolstoy resists the aristocratic ideology of his family, participates in the peasantry’s political struggles and, as a result, grasps the social conflicts determining Russia’s social and political development. Lukács faults naturalist and modernist works because they ignore or dismiss their social contexts.

Lucien Goldman shares Lukács’ realism but he argues that, as Miriam Glucksmann (1969) says, great works of art embody the world vision of the social group, usually a social class, of the writer; they can be understood only by reference to the trans-individual subject whose vision they express, and not by reference to the individual writer alone.

Like Lukács and Goldmann, Raymond Williams defends realism, but he says that a great writer successfully resists the deathly categories of abstract thought and remains true to concrete, experiential complexity. At the same time, Williams endows culture with a normative force independent of its proponents’ outlooks, beliefs, or biases. In *Culture and Society* (1983), for instance, Williams describes a cultural tradition which represents both a direct individual response to, and a critique of, industrial capitalism, which includes conservatives like Edmund Burke and T. S. Eliot, liberals like John Stuart Mill, and radicals like John Ruskin and William Morris. This tradition provides the terms and

the ideals by means of which these writers seek to oppose industrial capitalism and to improve human life.

Williams insisted that the truths asserted by these great writers express complex experience, not abstract theory. Yet, he also insisted that the cultural tradition of these writers led them to general historical truths or what he later called a "structure of feeling." Moreover, he faults the formal approach and rejects its elitist values. Although formal critics mean to construe literature as an expression of "life and thought," these critics ultimately reduce culture to the literary tradition and, thus, to what only a specialized minority of people can appreciate. As Williams (1985, 187) observes, they are "a literary-critical school assuming a necessary minority status but carrying the values of the past and a possibly emergent present."

Patrick Brantlinger (1990, 111–12) says that this broad, forceful account of a writer's socio-historical insights has made Williams' work a very compelling defense of culture's public import. Winifred Fluck (2002, 80–81) objects, however, that Williams' rejection of universal aesthetic values provided "one of the starting premises of revisionist approaches for which the discourse of aesthetics is merely a screen for unacknowledged ideological interests." Tony Bennett (1998, 21) grants that Williams wrongly expected history to guarantee the restoration of a lost wholeness; however, far from reducing aesthetics to "a screen for unacknowledged ideological interests," Williams' traditional view, according to Bennett (1998, 25) renewed "aesthetic forms of social and cultural criticism."

While Lukács, Goldmann, and Williams defend realism, Louis Althusser debunks it. Althusser (1969, 16) claims that Marx rejects the humanist myths justifying realism, including the belief that the real is the discourse of a voice, the written is the transparency of the true, and that sight reveals the unmediated truth of the world. Moreover, to defend this rupture with the Hegelian humanism of the realists, Althusser develops a rationalist view of science. He argues that it can grasp reality only if it rigorously develops its concepts and its terms, not if it conforms with practice, fact, or truth. A particular scientific discourse resists the ideological commitments which

form part of its history and, in keeping with the conventions, norms, and ideals which make up its context or "problematic," it elaborates its theoretical concepts. Economics, history, philosophy, mathematics, and other scientific disciplines and practices do not develop a general opposition of ideology and science. In keeping with their distinct problematics, they establish their own "inward" criteria of validity and produce their own legitimate objects and discourses. In these formal terms, scientific theory establishes its own criteria of truth. By contrast, what Althusser calls ideology imposes the familiar conformity of theory and practice or ideas and facts. This conformity is not altogether negative because Althusser endows ideology with a positive role; it constructs or "interpellates" a subject. Ideology does not represent falsehood or misrepresentation. Ideology explains the subject's role in a society's socio-economic structure or what Althusser calls the subject's relation to the relations of production.

In the 1970s, when the structuralist movement burst upon England, Terry Eagleton defended the structural Marxism of the Althusserians against the unsystematic empiricism of the formal critics. In *Criticism and Ideology* (1976), for example, Eagleton reworks the positivist opposition between emotive figural language and conceptual scientific language, but he rejects the inconsistent empiricist modes in which formal critics seek to reconcile "autonomous" literary language with human nature, concrete experience, or objective norms. What displaces these philosophical modes is Althusser's structural dichotomy of science and ideology. That dichotomy approximates but goes beyond the positivist opposition of figural language and conceptual discourse. Ideology and science exclude each other just as figural and conceptual discourses do. Eagleton readily adopts what the formal critics would disdain – the systematizing discourse of Roland Barthes and other structuralists. However, Eagleton's structuralism excludes from literary texts what their empiricism also excludes – positive scientific knowledge. Why else would Eagleton (1976, 71) say that the value of Jane Austen's fiction depends upon "the exclusion of the real as it is known to historical materialism?"

Literature and women

The criticism of women's literature has also turned political. As Eagleton's claim suggests, the work of Jane Austen is an example. The commentary of her nineteenth-century critics was purely analytical. The Victorian liberals, who include Richard Whately, Sir Walter Scott, Thomas Babington MacCauley, Julia Kavanaugh, and Goldwin Smith maintain that Austen's realism improves the reader. For instance, in "Modern Novels" (1821), Richard Whately says that even though Austen speaks "not in the language of general description, but in the form of well-constructed fictitious narrative," the moral lessons of her entertaining novels benefit the reader just as much as the lessons of "serious" essayists do (Gray 1993, 319). What makes her fiction so uplifting is its realistic depiction of everyday characters and ordinary events. As Whately says, "[C]ertainly no author has ever conformed more closely to real life, as well in the incidents, as in the characters and descriptions" (Gray 1993, 285). Sir Walter Scott, another early authorial critic, also appreciates Austen's "knowledge of the human heart, with the power and the resolution to bring that knowledge to the service of honour and virtue" as well as her "correct and striking representation of that which is daily taking place around" her reader (Southam 1987 Vol. I, 59, 63). However, Scott still favors the "big bow-wow strain" of his own romances, whose ideal characters and disinterested love relationships imitate "la belle nature" and not everyday life. Whately, by contrast, dismisses the romance's classical mythology, exotic adventures, unlikely coincidences, and fervent sentiments because they violate the Aristotelian ideal of probable action and generate unrealistic expectations of good fortune (Gray 1996, 317–18). More negative than Whately, Thomas Babington MacCauley, Julia Kavanaugh, and Goldwin Smith complain that Austen fails to evoke grand passions, to explore the concrete details of life, or to plumb its profound depths. However, these Victorian critics also praise Austen's self-effacing characterization and her discriminating realism. Modern scholars have found, however, that the "realist" rhetoric praised by these liberals expresses the class biases of standard English. These scholars show that Austen treats the propriety of diction and the norms of grammar as legitimate signs of

a character's moral character and social status (Phillips 1970, 11–12; Moler 1968, 73–80). As Tony Tanner (1986, 38) says, Austen's language does not admit dialects: "[T]he language of Jane Austen's novels excludes not only the unassimilable roughness and dissonance of workingclass speech but also any of the potential discordance of colloquial or vernacular discourse." In "The London University," the more liberal Macaulay, who called Austen the Shakespeare of English prose, defended the grammatical norms and "chaste" diction of the national language, the reforming, elevating powers of modern British literature, and the benefits of a secular, liberal education. In addition, Macaulay, who elected to Parliament several times, and whom Jonathan Arac (1990, 195) considers "one of the most publically powerful literary individuals that one can readily imagine" helped to write the 1853 East India Act. It is not surprising that the competitive civil service examination established by this Act enabled tutors at Oxford and Cambridge to teach English for the first time (Baldick 1983, 71) or that the *Civil Service Handbook of English Literature* required candidates to master Austen's fiction (Southam 1987 Vol. II, 5).

Some feminists consider the unselfconscious realism of these liberal Victorian critics the "greatest evil" because it assumes that instead of interpreting experience, characters and readers simply mirror it (Morgan 1989, 352). For instance, Mary Poovey (1984, 194–207) appreciates Austen's ironic moral truths, but she rejects the stereotype of Aunt Jane the withdrawn spinster. In the case of *Pride and Prejudice*, Poovey argues that Elizabeth's subversive wit defends her against the emotional vulnerability she shares with all unmarried women. At the first ball, when Darcy insults Elizabeth, touching her fear of spinsterhood, she responds with hostile wit. By contrast, when Wickham flatters Elizabeth, dishonestly encouraging her hostility to Darcy, she responds with romantic fantasies. In other words, Poovey grants that Elizabeth misunderstands both Darcy and Wickham. Poovey claims, however, that Darcy marries her because of his sexual desire and not because he learns to appreciate the Bennett family. Similarly, Elizabeth, who mistakenly assumed that her superior mind preserved her individual autonomy, marries not because she discovers the true Wickham,

Darcy, and Lydia but because her mistakes mortify her individualist pride. Poovey argues, just the same, that the romantic fantasies of the novel preserve the liberal ideal in which the marriage of Elizabeth and Darcy represents the perfect resolution of individual pleasure and social responsibility, or moral relativity and common social values. In other words, even though Poovey criticizes the Aunt Jane stereotype of the authorial reading, she still shows that the absolute moral values of the liberal ideal overcome the relativism of the characters' perspectives.

In *Communities of Women* (1978), Nina Auerbach denies that a self-determining Elizabeth reforms Darcy, or just recognizes his perfections and her illusions, as suggested by traditional readings of the novel. Auerbach suggests that what Elizabeth chooses, or what she and Darcy learn, do not matter because only the undemocratic male power of Darcy can effectively legitimate a woman's claims. In addition, Auerbach says that the Bennett family, Elizabeth's childhood, or the women's bodies lack sisterly warmth and remain shadowy and insubstantial until a Darcy or even a Collins endow them with concrete substance. The novel does not simply portray the narrow, limited existence of eighteenth-century women, or the universal conflicts of our human nature, as traditional critics claim; the novels show that Austen's era devalued and diminished women's lives by forcing them to wait for men to bring substance into their empty world.

Claudia Johnson also grants that the novel propounds conservative views, but she argues that the fierce conservative reaction to the French Jacobins made these conservative views obligatory. The novel's irony, double plotting, central female consciousness, and other devices show that Austen was, despite the repression, a feminist and not a conservative. Austen affirms conservative myths in order to subvert them from within. For instance, Johnson (1988, 369–70) grants the liberal belief that in *Pride and Prejudice* the ideal society successfully balances social hierarchy and individual energy, and patriarchal tradition and satirical wit. She argues that because this social arrangement requires not only the characters' intense arguments but also Darcy's profound reform, the novel does not affirm patriarchal traditions, as liberals claim, but the novel effectively criti-

cizes rigid conservative social structures in liberal terms.

Literature and race

In the 1930s, Richard Wright produced *Native Son* (1940), which reveals the politics of African-American literature, rather than the issues and differences of Austen's or women's literature. *Native Son* made Richard Wright famous and wealthy and influenced the next generation of black writers, including his critical friends Ralph Ellison and James Baldwin. At that time, the naturalist literary movement of Stephen Crane, Emile Zola, and Theodore Dreiser was very influential, whereas modernist or existential works were considered experimental or regressive and held in low esteem.

In "Fate," the last section of *Native Son*, Max the lawyer makes a 13-page speech arguing that centuries of African-American oppression explain why Bigger killed Mary Dalton and Bessie Smears and why other Blacks may commit similar crimes. The novel fosters both Max's politics and Bigger's liberation, but the pro-communist liberalism of Max, who represents the radical politics of the 1930s does not accord with the liberation of Bigger, who voices existential, modernist, or black views of freedom. Max's politics do not accord with Bigger's sense of freedom because Max, for all of his sympathy, does not understand or cannot accept Bigger's independence. The coherence of Max's political discourse and Bigger's homegrown existentialism breaks down because, as Edward Margolies (1968, 79–80) says: "Wright does not seem to be able to make up his mind. The reader feels that Wright, although intellectually committed to Max's views, is more emotionally akin to Bigger's."

Some critics fault this novel's affirmative, black or modernist notion of existential freedom on the historical grounds of its naturalist critique of racial oppression (Howe 1963; Burgum 1963; Bone 1969; Foley 1993; DeCoste 1998). For example, Damon DeCoste (1998, 141) says that Wright "uses the fact, the real, as his weapon both in court and in his assaults on Bigger's own cocoon of withdrawal." However, DeCoste (1998, 129) maintains that this realist critique disproves the poststructuralist "charge" that the "realist mode" represents "reaction and conservatism." Indeed, DeCoste (1998, 133,

143) argues that far from liberating himself, Bigger identifies with the wealthy whites oppressing him and rejects the realities of himself, his family, and his community, by confirming the racist stereotypes of the black rapist.

Other critics, who were formulating a professional canon of African-American literature, claim that the modernist work of Zora Neale Hurston and the naturalism of Wright are compatible despite the longstanding opposition of naturalism and modernism because, as June Jordan (1974, 5) suggests, "the functions of protest and affirmation are not, ultimately, distinct." In Jordan's analysis, Houston Baker assimilates the novel's naturalism and existentialism to the black experience. Baker (1972, 18) claims that Wright's existential outlook comes from black culture: "The fundamental conditions of black life in America led him to see that apriori moral values could scarcely be operating in the great scheme of events" (see, also, Jackson 1984, 129). As a result, Bigger's development does not break with his community's traditions and values but instead echoes the liberation depicted in nineteenth-century slave narratives: "Bigger's movement from bondage to freedom follows the same course: he repudiates white American culture, affirms black survival values, and serves as a model hero – a strong man getting stronger" (Jackson 1984, 5; Gayle 1970, 179). On similar grounds, Baker argues that the strong community of Black cultural life and not the nationalist policies of "Comrade Stalin" explain Max's pro-communist liberalism.

Other critics have defended the novel's naturalist critique of racial oppression, rather than its Biblical or mythic import, but these critics also defend Wright's authorial genius and public values. These critics fault Wright's black and modernist notions of existential freedom, reviving thereby the controversy about Max's speech justifying Bigger's killing Mary Dalton and Bessie Smear. Barbara Foley argues that by means of Max's speech *Native Son* makes an issue of the social critique which Dreiser's *American Tragedy* takes for granted. Moreover, Foley (1993, 189, 196) faults critics who object to Max's didactic speech on the grounds that instead of construing "proletarian fictions as rhetorical acts," they accept Henry James' bourgeois distinction between showing and telling (see, also, Bone 1958; Burgum 1970; DeCoste

1998; Gloster 1948; and Howe 1963). More importantly, like Joyce, Foley terms Bigger's "surge of existential freedom ... a twisted assertion of identity which, in its very deviance, profoundly condemns the social circumstances which have ... deprived Bigger of any coherent sense of self" ("Politics" 1993, 194; see, also, Burgum 1970, 122; Decoste 1998, 133–43). While Joyce construes the novel as a modern tragedy, Foley takes the novel to defend the communist politics of the 1930s. Nonetheless, unlike Baker, who argues that black cultural experience justifies both Bigger's liberation and Max's procommunist politics, Foley and Joyce both assume that the novel occupies a public space in which class politics or tragic flaws transcend ethnic or racial difference and reveal the universal truths of human nature or capitalist society.

Wright's naturalism was devalued and neglected until the 1970s, when faculty in newly established Black Studies programs began reinterpreting the novel. Houston Baker, Jr. observes that in the 1960s and 1970s, African-American literary criticism experienced a "paradigm shift" as the Black Power movement gave rise to a new Black Aesthetics, which dismissed Wright's realist belief that African-American literature adhered to common American ideals (*Blues* 76–7; DeCoste 1998, 128). As a paradigm shift implies, modern black criticism of the novel breaks radically with the politics and art of Wright's life and times to pursue its own aesthetic directions. Baker goes on, however, to revalue the novel. Robert Stepto and Henry Louis Gates, Jr. claim by contrast that *Native Son* fails to acknowledge its African-American cultural contexts or to employ the aesthetic devices of the Black literary tradition. To parody Wright's Marxism, Henry Louis Gates, Jr. interprets the novel as a matter of "race and superstructure" because Wright's *Native Son* continues what Gates terms the black drive to justify the race's intelligence (Appiah and Gates 1993, 30).

Other critics construe the novel as classical tragedy, and on the formal or rhetorical grounds that Wright's artistry matters more than the novel's politics, dismiss both the modernist import of Bigger's liberation and the naturalist justification of Max's radical speech. Joyce maintains, for example, that Bigger shows the blindness, ignorance, and purification which characterize the heroes of

classical tragedy. What justifies this claim is Joyce's faith in Wright's formal aesthetic mastery, which makes his language the perfect expression of his ideas. As Joyce (1996, 172) observes: "[N]aturalistic and existential views of Bigger as either a victimized or isolated figure limit the dimensions of Bigger's character and give no attention to how Wright's use of language punctuates the irony and ambiguity of Bigger's personality." This critique of naturalist and existential views assumes that Wright's artistic mastery warrants Joyce's classifying it as tragedy. Indeed, Joyce, who faults Baker and Gates for accommodating the white literary establishment assumes that the novel constructs a black public space which the purgation of tragedy returns to wholeness.

In the 1920s, Zora Neale Hurston, who published *Their Eyes Were Watching God* in 1937, emerged as an important voice of the Harlem Renaissance. Desperate for money, she worked as a maid and a waitress to put herself through high school and college. After she graduated from Barnard College, Mrs. Osgood-Mason, a very controlling woman whom she called "godmother," provided financial support for Hurston's research and writing. Because she entertained and flattered godmother and other whites so successfully, Hurston acquired the reputation of being a perfect "darkie" – simple, childlike, and primitive – because she successfully entertained and flattered her benefactor Mrs. Osgood-Mason (Washington 1937, 9–11).

After *Their Eyes Were Watching God* was published, it was generally ignored and Hurston lived in poverty. To account for the novel's neglect, many critics fault the Marxist realists who, like Richard Wright and Ralph Ellison, considered the novel indifferent to social injustice and class conflict. As Mary Helen Washington (1937, viii) notes: "By the end of the forties, a decade dominated by Wright and the stormy fiction of social realism, the quieter voice of a woman searching for self-realization could not, or would not, be heard." I grant that realists like Wright dismissed the novel because he believed that great literature reveals the causal nexus of social forces bringing about progressive social change. In this negative vein, Wright complained that *Their Eyes* "carries no theme, no message, no thought." Alluding to her demeaning reputation as "the perfect darkie," Wright observed that *Their*

Eyes entertains white readers "in minstrel fashion" (Appiah and Gates 1993, 17).

It was not until the 1960s and 1970s that African-American literary criticism revalued Hurston's *Their Eyes* and established in the major Anglo-American universities as part of the more widespread paradigm shift, which identified African-American literature with a peculiarly African-American experience, culture, language, and history. For this reason, in 1973, Alice Walker, author of the Pulitzer Prize winning *The Color Purple*, flew to Eatonville, Florida, to plant a tombstone on Hurston's unmarked grave. Posing as Hurston's niece, Walker (1979, 307) interviewed Hurston's physician, undertaker, and neighbors, wandered through the cemetery's waist-high grass in search of the forgotten grave, and commissioned a tombstone which declared Zora Neale Hurston "a genius of the South novelist folklorist anthropologist 1901–1960." Initiating the recovery of Hurston's work, Walker (1986, 69) insisted that "A people do not throw their geniuses away."

Conclusion

Traditional academic literary criticism maintains that it has a formal autonomy independent of politics. However, the work by realists, structuralist Marxists, feminists, and African-American literary critics demonstrates, however, that it does not escape politics.

PHILIP GOLDSTEIN

References

- Althusser, Louis. 1969. *For Marx*. Translated by Ben Brewster. New York: Random House.
- Arac, Jonathan. 1990. "Tradition, Discipline, and Trouble." *Profession* 90: 12–17.
- Auerbach, Nina. 1978. *Communities of Women: An Idea in Fiction*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Baker, Houston A., Jr. 1972. "Introduction." In *Twentieth Century Interpretations of Native Son; a Collection of Critical Essays*, edited by Houston A. Baker, 1–20. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Baldick, Chris. 1983. *The Social Mission of English Criticism, 1848–1932*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bennett, Tony. 1998. *Culture: A Reformer's Science*. St. Leonards, Australia: Allyn & Unwin.

- Bone, Robert. 1958. *The Negro Novel in America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Burgum, Edwin Berry. 1970. "The Promise of Democracy in Richard Wright's *Native Son*." In *Richard Wright's Native Son; A Critical Handbook*, edited by Richard Abcarian, 111–22. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Pub. Co.
- Brantlinger, Patrick. 1990. *Crusoe's Footprints: Cultural Studies in Britain and America*. New York: Routledge.
- DeCoste, Damon Marcel. 1998. "To Blot It All Out: The Politics of Realism in Richard Wright's *Native Son*." *Style*, 32, no. (Spring): 127–47.
- Eagleton, Terry. 1978 *Criticism & Ideology*. London: Verso Books.
- Foley, Barbara. 1993. "The Politics of Poetics: Ideology and Narrative Form in *An American Tragedy* and *Native Son*" in *Richard Wright: Critical Perspectives Past and Present*, edited by Henry Louis Gates, Jr., and K. A. Appiah, 188–99. New York: Amistad Press.
- Fluck, Winifred. 2002. "Aesthetics and Cultural Studies." *Aesthetics in a Multicultural Age*, edited by Emory Elliott, Louis Freitas, and Jeffrey Rhyne, 79–104. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Gates, Henry Louis Jr., and K. A. Appiah. 1993. "Preface." In *Richard Wright: Critical Perspectives Past and Present*, edited by Henry Louis Gates, Jr., and K. A. Appiah, xi–xvi. New York: Amistad Press.
- Gayle, Addison, Jr. 1970. "Richard Wright: Beyond Nihilism." In *Richard Wright's Native Son; A Critical Handbook*, edited by Richard Abcarian, 177082. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Gloster, Hugh. 1948. *Negro Voices in American Fiction*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Glucksman, Miriam. 1969. "Lucien Goldman Humanist or Marxist." *New Left Review* 1/56 (July–August): 49–61.
- Goldmann, Lucien. 1977. *Lukacs and Heidegger: Towards a New Philosophy*, translated by William Q. Boelhower. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Graff, Gerald. 1979. *Literature Against Itself: Literary Ideas in Modern Society*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Hirsch, E. D., Jr. 1976. *The Aims of Interpretation*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Howe, Irving. 1970. "Black Boys and Native Sons." Rpt. in *Richard Wright's Native Son: A Critical Handbook*, edited by Richard Abcarian Belmont, 135–43. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.
- Jackson, Esther Merle. 1984. "The American Negro and the Image of the Absurd." In *Richard Wright: A Collection of Critical Essays*, edited by Richard Macksey and Frank E. Moore, 129–38. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Jancovich, Mark. 1993. *The Cultural Politics of the New Criticism*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, Claudia L. 1988. *Jane Austen: Women, Politics, and the Novel*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Jordan, June. 1974. "On Richard Wright and Zora Neale Hurston: Notes Toward a Balancing of Love and Hatred." *Black World* (August): 4–8.
- Joyce, Joyce Ann. 1986. *Richard Wright's Art of Tragedy*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.
- Kavanaugh, Julia. 1863. *English Women of Letters*. London: Hurst and Blackett.
- Lukács, Georg. 1950. *Studies in European Realism*. London: The Hillway Pub. Co.
- Macaulay, Thomas Babington. 1972. "The London University." Rpt. in *Selected Writings*, edited by John Clive and Thomas Pinney, 4–33. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Moler, Kenneth. L. 1968. *Jane Austen's Art of Allusion*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Morgan, Susan. 1980. *In the Meantime Character and Perception in Jane Austen's Fiction*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Poovey, Mary. 1984. *The Proper Lady and the Woman Writer: Ideology as Style in the Works of Mary Wollstonecraft, Mary Shelley, and Jane Austen*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Skerrett, Joseph T., Jr. 1977. "Composing Bigger: Wright and the Making of *Native Son*." In *Critical Essays on Richard Wright's Native Son*, edited by Kenneth Kinnamon, 26–39. New York: Twayne Publishers.
- Smith, Goldwin. 1890. *The Life of Jane Austen*. London: Walter Scott.
- Southam, B. C. 1987. *Jane Austen: The Critical Heritage*. Vol. I. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Southam, B.C. 1987. *Jane Austen: The Critical Heritage*. Vol. II. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Tanner, Tony. 1986. *Jane Austen*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Walker, Alice. 1986. "A Cautionary Tale and a Partisan View." In *Zora Neale Hurston*, edited and introduced by Harold Bloom, 63–9. New York: Chelsea House Publishers.
- Walker, Alice. 1979. "Looking for Zora." In *I Love Myself When I am Laughing ... And Then Again When I am Looking Mean and Impressive: A Zora Neale Hurston Reader*, edited by Alice Walker, introduced by Mary Helen Washington, 297–313. New York: The Feminist Press.
- Washington, Mary Helen. 1990 [1937]. "Foreword." *Their Eyes Were Watching God*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Whately, Richard. 1963 [1828]. *Elements of Rhetoric Compromising an Analysis of the Laws of Moral Evidence and of Persuasion*,

- with Rules for Argumentative Composition and Elocution.* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Williams, Raymond. *Culture and Society*. 1983. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Williams, Raymond. *Writing in Society*. London: Verso Editions, 1985.
- Wright, Richard. *Native Son*. 1989. New York: HarperCollins.

44. Science fiction

Authors in *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature* (2010), edited by Gregory Claeys, note how beginning in the nineteenth century, but especially in the twentieth century, science fiction and utopian literatures conflate into one. It is seemingly the case that with the advent of modernity, and its normative vaunting of technological progress, it is well-nigh impossible to distinguish between science fiction and utopian fiction (Hassler and Willcox 2008). Nonetheless, it is still analytically useful to point out that science fiction fantasy is substantively different from utopian fiction that is predicated upon presently unimaginable scientific revolutions. The most popular example of what I would classify as science fiction fantasy is the *Star Wars* franchise. In the first frame of the initial *Star Wars* movie, it is declared that its action takes place in a “galaxy far, far away” – telling us that the narrative is a work of fantasy, and not one actively seeking to map current social, political, and economic trends into the future. Carl Freedman, in his essay “Science Fiction and Utopia,” offers an observation that aids in distinguishing science fiction fantasy from utopian science fiction. Specifically, Freedman (2001, 74) holds that a key aspect of utopian literature and art is “the future [as an] object of *hope*” for “a revolutionary reconfiguration of the world as a totality” (see Moylen 1986).

The *Star Trek* franchise is a powerful piece of political theory because of the arguments it makes about how human society becomes a classless, thriving, and prosperous society free of economic deprivation and without gender or ethnic biases. In this way, *Star Trek* is a political tract which argues that humans and, more specifically Americans, can and should achieve an ideal political, social, and economic system (i.e., a utopia). Two points made by *Star Trek* as to how society can achieve an ideal state are the need for world government and that social progress occurs through what can be deemed “revolutionary” events. This is consistent with Karl Marx’s argument that one of the keys to political justice, freedom, and stability is internationalism. Marx also argued that political and economic progress occurs through a series of revolutions, which culminate in a class-

less, just, and peaceful global society (Singer 2001).

Thus, *Star Trek* is not solely a work of technological optimism, that is, the idea that technological advancement will alone drive social and political progress (Klein 2001). In fact, *Star Trek* renders cautions against unchecked or unregulated scientific and technological advancement (Shapiro 2004). For example, one theme that appears in the *Star Trek* franchise is eugenics. In *Star Trek* historiography there is in the Earth’s past (or our near future) a Eugenics War – “an improved breed of human. That’s what the Eugenics War was all about.” The war resulted when “young supermen” seized “power simultaneously in over forty nations ... They were aggressive, arrogant. They began to battle among themselves” (“Space Seed” 1967; *Star Trek* – the original). As a result of this experience, human genetic engineering is banned in the fictional world of *Star Trek*. The other prime caution that *Star Trek* yields is a warning against “technologism,” that is, an uncritical faith in science and engineering as exemplified by the Borg. The Borg (first appearing in *The Next Generation*) embraces technology to such an extreme extent that they replace large parts of their body (and brain) with gadgets. Every Borg is mechanically altered by force if necessary. The result is the Borg do not create knowledge, but can only appropriate (i.e., “assimilate”) it from others (“Scorpion” 1997; *Star Trek: Voyager*). Hence, a prominent argument in *Star Trek* is that if technological development is to serve as a basis for justice, freedom, and societal well-being, humanity must get its politics “right.” Otherwise, technological and scientific advancement can result in eugenics, for instance, or other inherently oppressive and destructive outcomes (e.g., the Borg).

World government in *Star Trek* ostensibly comes about because the nation-state system is a major political liability. *Star Trek*, the original series (1966–69), notes that humanity experienced a World War III in the 1990s, where tens-of-millions of people died. Spock, in “Bread and Circuses” (1968), lists Earth’s three world wars in the twentieth century along with specific numbers of dead: “six million” in World War I; “11 million” in World War II; and “37 million” in World War III. In “Space Seed” (1967) the following is rendered: “The mid-1990s was the era of your last so-called world war” – The

Eugenics War. As was the case in World War I and II, nation-states were the platforms for this fictional World War III. *Star Trek: The Next Generation* posits an episode with a world divided into two countries, which are beset with hostility, loathing, and deep suspicion toward one another (“Attached” 1993).

Star Trek’s fictional history, where Earth’s wars become progressively devastating, is consistent with Lenin’s theory of international relations. Lenin (1996) argued that as capitalist economies became more and more unstable due to declining investment returns (as theorized by Marx), the world’s nation-state system would de-stabilize and result in wars of greater and greater proportion (Read 2005). The creators of the original series worked in the aftermath of World War II and during the height of the Cold War. Thus, writing about a third world war occurring within a 30-year frame was not much of a stretch. While this was a pessimistic view about humanity’s inability to avoid another major war within a generation, Star Trek is optimistic about humanity’s ability to overcome such devastating destruction and ultimately abolish one prime source of this devastation – the nation-state.

Present international politics point to the need for world government, as nation-states are continuing to serve as the basis for major geopolitical tensions. For instance, China becoming the new global center of (low wage) industrial investment (Markoff 2018, 86; Bradsher 2019, A1) is viewed as a threat to U.S. global hegemonic authority (Yuan 2018, B1; Bradsher 2018, B1).

The optimism about world government inherent in Star Trek and by implication the American mind is in part based on modern technology. With modern means of transportation and communication, the possibility of governing on a global scale appears absurdly obvious. This was even the case in the 1960s (*à la* Star Trek), before the current computer and internet revolution. The opportunity for world governance is so patent in a context where people are constantly traveling and communicating across the globe (Beck and Cronin, 2006) that darkly cast conspiracies of international government (i.e., the United Nations) are common fare amongst extremist nationalist groups – those most politically wed to their nation-states (Johnson and Potok, 2012). Extreme nationalism in opposition to global governance in the current epoch

is consonant with the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* produced by the Russian Czar’s secret police at the turn of the twentieth century, where world government is cast as a dangerous cabal. The *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* can be perceived to be in direct response to *Angel of the Revolution*, written by H.G. Wells in 1892. Wells holds in this work of fiction that an Anglo-American-centered revolution defeats the forces of reaction and aristocracy worldwide and thereby establishes a global government founded on reason and justice (Mozower 2012, 26–30).

Regardless of whether world government is conceived as an objectionable impingement upon the sacred/venerable nation, or the institutional basis for peace and freedom, some type of world-wide regulatory regime is becoming more and more necessary. This is particularly evident with the climate change phenomenon (Biermann 2014). Pointing to the inherent difficulties of protecting the environment in the context of multiple nation-states that have absolute sovereignty, the 1986 movie *Star Trek: The Voyage Home* explains that in the late twentieth century in spite of international agreements to prohibit whale hunting particular countries continue to sanction their killing (Dorsey 2013).

Related to the global warming phenomenon is the expanding human population (Firor and Jacobsen, 2002). Over the course of the twentieth century, and into the twenty-first, humanity has grown more than fourfold – from 1.6 billion to 8 billion – consuming increasing amounts of energy, food, and land (Higgs 2014). “The Mark of Gideon” (1969), an original *Star Trek* series episode, conveys a planet where its population grows unchecked. This creates profound social and political problems. “The Conscience of the King” (1967) references a dilemma in which a colony was too large for its food supply.

Transportation and communication technologies are not the only reason that Star Trek is optimistic about the possibilities and benefits of world government. American concepts of social/political assimilation (i.e., “America the Great Melting Pot”) also inform Star Trek’s optimism. The internationalist pretenses of Star Trek are a product of the American belief that all humans are capable of being assimilated into modern Western political culture – the highest manifestation of this culture presumably being the U.S. Hence, the notion of the “American

Melting Pot,” where people from throughout the world can come to the U.S. and be accepted. Viewing this from an optimistic stance, the claim put forward (and embedded in *Star Trek*) is that modernity is transparent and accessible to all, as well as places few political burdens on individuals. Especially important, there are no religious obligations, nor any associated with ethnicity or lineage (Schlesinger 1988; Rubin and Verheul 2010; Lacorne 2001; Tocqueville 2011). Captain Picard declares: “If there’s one ideal the Federation holds most dear it’s that all men, all [alien] races, can be united” (*Star Trek: Nemesis* 2002).

Perhaps the core optimism conveyed in *Star Trek* is the ability of people from all ethnic backgrounds (and from other planets) to live peacefully together and fruitfully collaborate. During a *Next Generation* 1990 episode, a visiting alien is very impressed with the highly diverse background of the Enterprise crew: “Truly remarkable.” “These people ... they’re all so different from one another ... yet they work together freely” (“Transfigurations” 1992). Operating through reason, science, and a common language (English), humans virtually throughout the *Star Trek* series and movies get along with little rancor or divisiveness. *Star Trek* is also distinctive for the intelligence and maturity of humans (and that of their fictional alien partners). A particular signature feature of *Star Trek* is the ability of its characters to maneuver complex (fictional) technologies. This is indicative of the putative transparency and accessibility of reason, science, and technology. It is also reflective of the belief that virtually every human has the mental capability to attain very high levels of knowledge, emotional maturity, and technical proficiency.

According to *Star Trek* this plateau of human development is the result of revolutionary processes. Therefore, human advancement is not simply the result of “natural” progression, but instead it is in part the result of conceptualizing America as a continuing project of “justice.” Hence, if America is exceptional, it is because it was founded on abstract principles of justice. Ideally, people from any place or ethnic background can join this project.

To the American Revolutionary War, the U.S. Civil War, and the American fight against Fascism, *Star Trek* adds to America’s

revolutionary “moments” with the Bell Uprising. Aired in 1995, “Past Tense” (*Deep Space Nine* [1993–99]) is centered on this fictional uprising against the social, economic effects of global neoliberalism. The characters Sisko, Bashir, and Dax are accidentally sent back to 2024 San Francisco. They encounter the San Francisco “Sanctuary District” – an urban zone where untold numbers of the poor and dispossessed are forcibly interned: “by the early twenty-twenties there was a place like this in every major city in the United States” – dirty, dilapidated, and overcrowded with “people without jobs or places to live.” Sanctuary Districts are a metaphor for the de-industrialization, job loss, and disinvestment that major American urban areas – such as Detroit (Sugrue 2005; Drape 2013) and Cleveland (Miller and Wheeler 2009) – experienced as a result of neoliberal global capitalism (McKee 2009), with much of U.S. industry moving to cheaper labor venues (Gallagher 2005; Gallagher 2006). “Past Tense” also refers to the tendency of technology to replace or displace employment (Brynjolfsson and McAfee 2012; Roose 2021). A Sanctuary District resident explains that “they laid a bunch of us off when they got some new equipment ... and so I ended up here.”

Star Trek is not only critical of the economics and politics of neoliberalism, but it also takes aim at capitalism. *Star Trek* explicitly rejects capitalism in *The Next Generation* (1987–94) episode “The Neutral Zone” (1988): in the twenty-fourth century “People are no longer obsessed with the accumulation of ‘things’. We have eliminated hunger, want, the need for possessions. We have grown out of our infancy.” *Star Trek: Discovery* (2017–present): “capitalism” is expressly linked to slavery (Kara 2017) and predatory foreign policy machinations (“There Is a Tide ...” 2021).

Similarly, in the *Deep Space Nine* episode “In the Cards” (1997), Jake Sisko exclaims “I’m Human, I don’t have any money.” Nog, a Ferengi – an alien race that operates on the profit-motive – is critical of twenty-fourth-century humanity: “It’s not my fault that your species decided to abandon currency-based economics in favor of some philosophy of self-enhancement.” Shifting humanity’s (America’s) values away from “currency-based economics” and toward a “philosophy of self-enhancement” mirrors

Karl Marx's point that in moving from capitalism to communism society would go "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs!" – that is, communist politics would focus on "the all-around development of the individual" (Marx 2001, 20). Or as Jake told Nog: "There's nothing wrong with our philosophy. We work to better ourselves and the rest of Humanity."

Indicative of how humans in the twenty-fourth century have undergone a profound paradigm shift in values and outlook, Quark, a Ferengi who traveled back to mid-twentieth century Earth (more specifically, the United States), concludes from his dealings with humans (Americans) in this epoch, that "these humans, they're not like the ones from the [twenty-fourth century] Federation. They're crude, gullible and greedy" ("Little Green Men" 1995; *Deep Space Nine*). Marx offers a consonant rebuke of the cultural/social ethos of capitalists: "Contempt for theory, art, history, and for man as an end in himself ... is the real, conscious standpoint, the virtue of the man of money" (Marx 2010 [1844] 172).

Star Trek is optimistic insofar as arguing that as global society accepts modernity, reason, and science (i.e., the Enlightenment) humans will collectively achieve a higher plane of intelligence, knowledge, and emotional maturity. As is well known, this is an optimism shared by Marx: in "communist society ... the all-round development of the individual" will be achieved by all (Marx 2001, 20).

GEORGE A. GONZALEZ

References

- Beck, Ulrich and Ciaran Cronin. 2006. *Cosmopolitan Vision*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Biermann, Frank. 2014. *Earth System Governance: World Politics in the Anthropocene*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.
- Bradsher, Keith. 2018. "2 Possible Paths Emerge in China Trade War." *New York Times*, August 9.
- Bradsher, Keith. 2019. "Rethinking China's Role as the World's Factory." *New York Times*, April 6.
- Brynjolfsson Erik, and Andrew McAfee. 2012. *Race Against the Machine: How the Digital Revolution is Accelerating Innovation, Driving Productivity, and Irreversibly Transforming Employment and the Economy*. San Francisco: Digital Frontier Press.
- Claeys, Gregory, ed. 2010. *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dorsey, Kurkpatrick. 2013. *Whales and Nations: Environmental Diplomacy on the High Seas*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Drape, Joe. 2013. "Bankruptcy for Ailing Detroit, but Prosperity for Its Teams." *New York Times*, October 14.
- Firor, John, and Judith Jacobsen. 2002. *The Crowded Greenhouse: Population, Climate Change, and Creating a Sustainable World*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Freedman, Carl. 2001. "Science Fiction and Utopia: A Historico-Philosophical Overview." In *Learning from Other Worlds*, edited by Patrick Parrinder, 74. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Gallagher, Kelly. 2006. *China Shifts Gears: Automakers, Oil, Pollution, and Development*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Gallagher, Mary. 2005. *Contagious Capitalism: Globalization and the Politics of Labor in China*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hassler, Donald and Clyde Wilcox, eds. *New Boundaries in Political Science Fiction*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- Higgs, Kerryn. 2014. *Collision Course: Endless Growth on a Finite Planet*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.
- Johnson, Daryl and Mark Potok. 2012. *Right-Wing Resurgence: How a Domestic Terrorist Threat is Being Ignored*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Kara, Siddharth. 2017. *Modern Slavery: A Global Perspective*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Klein, Gérard. 2001. "From the Images of Science to Science Fiction." In *Learning from Other Worlds*, edited by Patrick Parrinder, 119–26. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Lacorne, Denis. 2001. *Religion in America: A Political History*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lenin, V. I. 1996 [1917]. *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*. New York: Pluto.
- Markoff, John. 2018. "When Apple Was Homegrown." *New York Times*, December 17.
- Marx Karl. 2010 [1844]. "On the Jewish Question." In *Marx-Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 3, 146–75. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Marx, Karl. 2001 [1875]. *The Critique of the Gotha Programme*. London: Electric Book Co.
- McKee, Guin. 2009. *The Problem of Jobs: Liberalism, Race, and Deindustrialization in Philadelphia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Miller, Carol and Robert Wheeler. 2009. *Cleveland: A Concise History*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

- Moylen, Tom, ed. 1986. *Demand the Impossible: Science Fiction and the Utopian Imagination*. New York: Methuen.
- Mozower, Mark. 2012. *Governing the World: The History of an Idea*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Read, Christopher. 2005. *Lenin: A Revolutionary Life*. New York: Routledge.
- Roose, Kevin. 2021. "The Robots Are Coming For Phil in Accounting." *New York Times*, March 7.
- Rubin, Derek and Jaap Verheul, eds. 2010. *American Multiculturalism after 9/11: Transatlantic Perspectives*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Schlesinger, Arthur. 1988. *The Disuniting of America: Reflections on a Multicultural Society*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Segrue, Thomas. 2005. *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Shapiro, Alan. 2004. *Star Trek. Technologies of Disappearance*. Berlin: Avinus Press.
- Singer, Peter. 2001. *Marx: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tocqueville, Alexis. 2011 [1835]. *Democracy in America*, translated by Harvey C. Mansfield and Delba Winthrop. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Yuan, Li. 2018. "Retooling China, From the Bottom Up." *New York Times*, July 5.

45. Art

Art today is diverse, multi-dimensional, and politically consequential. It infiltrates our everyday lives, for better and worse, as popular, commercial, community, and public art, while directly touching most people's lives episodically, if at all, as so-called high art. Even in the latter case of so-called high art, however, the political consequences often touch the everyday lives of ordinary people.

Access to the arts has expanded along with digital technology, increasing possibilities for both the creation of art and participation in it. Any internet search will turn up countless portals to film, television, music, printmaking, photography, painting, sculpture, drama, dance, performance art, literature, graffiti and street artists, and many more. The COVID-19 pandemic beginning in 2020 sped up this process of expanding digital access to the arts by driving many artists and their fans to expand the boundaries of the artistically possible through digital technology.

Activists have made extensive use of this expanding terrain of art. Almost all the social movements, and many other practices of resistance, of the last two decades have integrated artistic artifacts and practices (Reed 2019; Serafini 2018). Examples include the street theatre of the alterglobalization and Occupy movements, the pussy hats of the Women's Marches of early 2017, and the silk-screened images of George Floyd during the 2020 Black Lives Matter rebellions. Each of these developments inspired participation and drew threads of connection and solidarity through progressive activist communities throughout the US and beyond.

For the most part, mainstream political scientists remain uninterested. A scan of mainstream political science journals' tables of contents over the last 20 years shows a striking indifference to art, broadly defined. Save for an occasional book review, most mainstream journals published nothing on art during this period. By contrast, the journals identified in this volume as critical collectively published many articles, special issues, and reviews about art. Some also published original art, especially poetry, and occasionally photography, cartooning, and other images. And some published articles

about art installations and performances. Journals in other academic disciplines, especially the humanities, also routinely address the politics of art. Many art world magazines and journals, including *Art in America*, *artnet Magazine*, *Artforum*, *BOMB*, and *Guernica*, routinely address the political significance of art in essays, stories, articles, reviews, and examples of the politics of art. Many of these are written from a critical, progressive point of view.

Why *should* political scientists, mainstream or alternative, be interested in art? Because art is one social terrain where politics occurs, simply put. It is one communicative arena where questions of identity and the terms of everyday life are expressed and contested, where relations of power are expressed, (re)produced, and contested, and where political struggle occurs. Art is one of the ways we make sense of the world, explain it, shape it, change it, celebrate it, and endure it.

Debates over "What is art?" and "Is it art?" and "Who or what is an artist?" and "Is it good or bad art?" erect, defend, and shatter barriers to art and political participation, often revealing relative positions of power and interest. While these are important questions, the main question for a critical political scientist is: What are the implications of art for 'building of a new society based on an egalitarian economic, social, and political order without class exploitation, institutionalized racism and sexism, imperialism, and catastrophic environmental destruction'? ("Guiding Principles of the *Encyclopedia of Critical Political Science*").

Especially considering these "Guiding Principles," there are good practical reasons for a critical political scientist to embrace an expansive understanding of art that encompasses popular, community, and public forms excluded by elite and so-called high art accounts. They touch more lives in politically consequential ways. Art in these forms is closer to the everyday lives of marginalized people, more accessible, and more meaningful to them. With their interest in changing the world progressively and democratically, critical political scientists may also be particularly interested in art for its role in imaginatively envisioning alternative worlds.

Interpreting the world

Art shapes society and society shapes art. Art is one window into individual and group identity, behavior, and social relations. As a text for interpretation, art can be read for what it tells us about current, past, and, as prefigurative art, future identities and social relations. Issues of artistic intent complicate the task of interpreting art. Most graffiti artists create their art without political intent. Yet, their art rebukes both the capitalist state for its failure to do its primary job in a neoliberal society of protecting property, and makes a mockery of capitalist commodification by creating art that, for the most part, does not and cannot circulate as a commodity. Monumental art is often created and installed to celebrate a cultural or historical moment, sometimes without explicit political intent. But it solidifies – literally, in stone, bronze, or other metal – a dominant, usually-elite account of history that erases alternative accounts.

Even works of art created with clear intent by the artist may present challenges to political interpretation, analysis and critique. Does Andres Serrano's "Piss Christ," a photograph of a crucifix dunked in a beaker of urine, sanctify the human body, as Serrano intended, or does it defile a Christian relic, as his critics charge?

Some artists intend that their artwork says something *about* the world, while others only wish for their artwork to exist *in* the world. But once the artwork is released, its meaning becomes subject to varying interpretations and contested uses, at least some of them political. Picasso may have intended nothing political in his untitled Daley Plaza sculpture in Chicago (he was allegedly inspired either by an Afghan hound or a friend's daughter), but it nevertheless functions politically to legitimize state and corporate power by beautifying their adjacent spaces and structures.

The art work's social context further complicates the task of interpretation. The meaning of Mount Rushmore is derived in part from a history of conquest, exploitation, and enslavement of Indigenous and Black people. Obviously intended to celebrate great White men, Mount Rushmore speaks volumes about White Americans' willingness to discount the sanctioned slaughter of Indigenous people and takeover of the

sacred Black Hills. In 2020 President Trump attempted to call upon this narrative of great White men to bolster his political standing, but inevitably revealed at least as much about his own racism.

Changing the world

Progressive activists use art in diverse and creative ways to change the world. They express political ideas, advocate for justice, organize communities of survival and resistance, open spaces for living their values in the present, gather democratic power, challenge undemocratic power, and advance social movements.

Of course, art is also used for undemocratic purposes. Examples include White Nationalist music (Love 2016), public art that beautifies and legitimizes corporate and state power, and ubiquitous commercial art that legitimizes capitalist social relations by normalizing and deepening the commodification of everyday life. Art in these cases becomes a form of social control by dominant forms of power.

Most foundational thinkers in art as critical political science have addressed the use of art in achieving critical consciousness to expose undemocratic forms and uses of power. Antonio Gramsci (1971) said relatively little directly about art, but his concepts of hegemony and organic intellectual have been used productively by scholars and activists interested in the power of art to develop working class consciousness and mount a war of position against undemocratic forms of power. Although Gramsci's argument focused squarely on class, it is readily broadened to apply to any marginalized community.

John Dewey situated art within his attack on existing undemocratic power relations, beginning with its role in stripping away "the crust of conventionalized and routine consciousness" to achieve critical consciousness (Dewey 1988 [1927], 349). Dewey cited the use by Nazi Germany of art as a form of propaganda and noted similar trends at work in the US (Dewey 1991 [1939], 70), while nevertheless emphasizing the democratic, liberatory potential of art.

Emma Goldman had earlier developed similar themes in her analysis of popular drama, arguing that "any mode of creative work which with true perception por-

trays social wrongs earnestly and boldly is a greater menace ... and a more powerful inspiration than the wildest harangue of the soapbox orator" (Goldman 1987 [1914], 1–2). Goldman referred to modern dramatic art as "dynamite" that "undermines superstition, shakes the social pillars, and prepares men and women for the reconstruction" of society (Goldman 1987 [1914], 3). Echoing these themes, Jacques Rancière (2010, 140) posed art activism as a form of disrupting consensus, where consensus represented some form of concentrated power. Art activism challenges the status quo by disrupting it.

Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno asked whether art can function as a foundation for political critique and transformation in a capitalist political economy, when pressures to commodify it often overwhelm other considerations (Horkheimer and Adorno 2002 [1947]; Adorno 1997 [1970]). Although skeptical of the possibility of autonomous art – art independent of commodity circulation – Adorno nevertheless valued politically-engaged art as a partial remedy to sterile mainstream art created for, and consumed by, elites. He argued the "truth content" of art is the way that an artwork both serves as social critique and utopian vision (Adorno 1997 [1970]).

Dewey additionally situated art within his problem-solving politics as a resource for community organizing. As shared experience, art potentially serves as a means of finding or creating common ground for action (Dewey 1989 [1934]). This may take shape initially as a form of political deliberation occurring through art, as art captures different experiences and encourages communication across differences.

Dewey's emphasis on the artist as community organizer places him in the company of contemporary community arts advocates. Community arts are activist in orientation, with a goal of creating a public capable of addressing a shared interest or problem. The community arts movement appeared partly in reaction to perceived shortcomings of elite, high art formulations that emphasize the artist as a credentialed genius, art as a product rather than a process, and art participation by common people limited to its consumption. This approach is tainted by its close association with exclusivity, elitism, and commodity capitalism. Often, the art

as commodity disappears into private collections or is performed in high art temples that price out most marginalized people. It may also serve as propaganda for existing power structures and divides communities along class and racial lines by segregating experience.

Community artists are organic intellectuals of a sort, socially embedded in their respective, often marginalized, communities. They are positioned to understand and express shared interests in artistic forms that congeal commonalities across difference. They take the process of artistic creation seriously, insisting that the development of community and solving public problems is at least as important as any artifact that emerges. Community artists catalyze rather than impose. They play a dialogic, collaborative role in engaging community members in participation in the work of art, which includes community development and problem solving. They seek active inclusion and participation in the creation of art by community members (Mattern and Love 2013). Emblematic forms include community choirs and orchestras, murals, community theatre, and collaborative photography. These themes sometimes find expression in large-scale art forms like the AIDS Quilt used by AIDS activists to create a "great community" (Dewey 1988 [1927]) with power to affect change.

Goldman and other anarchists have tied art to their longstanding commitment to direct action. In recent years, some have pursued a strategy of prefiguration in which activists use art to open spaces for living anarchist values in the present, circumventing at least partly the dominant institutions of state and capitalism. Art also plays a prefigurative role in imagining and creating alternative visions and worlds. (Goldman 1987 [1914], 1931, 1934; Graeber 2009; Kropotkin 1970 [1880]; Mattern 2016; Proudhon 1865).

What makes art distinctive as a form and vehicle of activism? Popular artists are often embedded in the everyday lives of ordinary people. They and their art are readily accessible, especially for marginalized people who often find themselves locked out of dominant, mainstream political processes. This makes the participation of marginalized people more possible and likely. And it makes it more possible and likely that art as process and artifact will represent the iden-

tities and interests of marginalized people. Additionally, at least some forms of art draw attention and motivate action in ways that the spoken word may not. It taps into our emotions as well as intellects, the affective as well as rational, sometimes building empathy and motivating action (Gregory et al. 2002; Nussbaum 2010), but also of course to build hate and block progressive change.

Art, vision, utopia

Emma Goldman allegedly once said “If I can’t dance, I don’t want to be part of your revolution.” Although the quote is apocryphal, she did defend her enthusiasm for dancing as a physical and emotional manifestation of the life she wanted to lead, a life she associated with anarchism. This idealized life would be filled with more beauty and joy, more free expression, and less drudgery and domination. Jill Dolan’s “utopian performatives,” and John Dewey’s “art as experience” are comparable attempts to articulate the same point as Goldman (Dolan 2005; Dewey 1989 [1934]). Both describe wholly engrossing artistic and aesthetic experiences in which a better world is glimpsed, however fleetingly. Examples include an opera flash mob that briefly and spectacularly injects beauty and joy into the mundane everyday, or a Dan Witz hummingbird, painted on a random surface in Manhattan, that surprises pedestrians with a flash of inspiration and adrenalin. These offer direct visceral experience of a different, potentially better, world with less drudgery and more beauty.

Many activists harness the power of art for political action to change the world. To what degree, if any, are their efforts successful? Under what circumstances? What can we learn from them? These questions warrant more attention from scholars. These same scholars may also consider injecting more art into the akademisphere by publishing examples of art, and integrating more links to the world of art.

MARK MATTERN

References

- Adorno, Theodor. 1997 [1970]. *Aesthetic Theory*, translated by R. Hullot-Kentor. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Dewey, John. 1988 [1927]. *The Public and its Problems*. In *John Dewey: The Later Works, 1925–1953*, Volume 2: 1925–1927, edited by Jo Ann Boydston, 235–372. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, John. 1989 [1934]. “Art as Experience.” In *John Dewey: The Later Works, 1925–1953*, Volume 10, edited by Jo Ann Boydston. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, John. 1991 [1939]. *Freedom and Culture*. In *John Dewey: The Later Works, 1925–1953*, Volume 13: 1938–1939, edited by Jo Ann Boydston, 65–188. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dolan, Jill. 2005. *Utopia in Performance: Finding Hope at the Theater*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Goldman, Emma. 1987 [1914]. *The Social Significance of Modern Drama*. New York: Applause Theater Book Publishers.
- Goldman, Emma. 1931 and 1934. *Living My Life*, Volume I. New York: Alfred Knopf.
- Goldman, Emma. 1931 and 1934. *Living My Life*, Volume II. Hempstead, NY: Garden City Publishing Co.
- Graeber, David. 2009. “Anarchism, Academia, and the Avant-garde.” In *Contemporary Anarchist Studies: An Introductory Anthology of Anarchy in the Academy*, edited by Randall Amster, Abraham DeLeon, Luis A. Fernandez, Anthony J. Nocella II, and Deric Shannon, 103–12. New York: Routledge.
- Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, edited and translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. New York: International Publishers.
- Gregory, Jill, April Lewton, Mark Mattern, Stephanie Schmidt, and Diane Smith. 2002. “Body Politics with Feeling: The Power of the Clothesline Project.” *New Political Science* 24, no. 3: 433–48.
- Horkheimer, Max, and Theodor Adorno. 2002 [1947]. *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, edited by G. S. Noerr and translated by E. Jephcott. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Kropotkin, Peter. 1970 [1880]. “Appeal to the Young.” In *Kropotkin’s Revolutionary Pamphlets*, edited by Roger Baldwin, 260–82. New York: Dover Press.
- Love, Nancy S. 2016. *Trendy Fascism: White Power Music and the Future of Democracy*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Mattern, Mark. 2016. *Anarchism and Art: Democracy in the Cracks and on the Margins*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Mattern, Mark, and Nancy S. Love. 2013. “Activist Arts, Community Development, and Democracy.” In *Doing Democracy: Activist Art*

- and Cultural Politics*, edited by Nancy S. Love and Mark Mattern, 339–66. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Nussbaum, Martha. 2010. *Not for Profit: Why Democracy Needs the Humanities*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Proudhon, Pierre. 1865. *Du principe de l'art et de sa destination social*. Paris: Garnier Frères.
- Rancière, Jacques. 2010. *Dissensus: On Politics and Aesthetics*, edited and translated by Steven Corcoran. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Reed, T. V. 2019. *The Art of Protest: Culture and Activism from the Civil Rights Movement to the Present*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Serafini, Paula. 2018. *Performance Action: The Politics of Art Activism*. London: Routledge.

See also

Critical Film Studies; Critical Media Studies;
Literary Criticism; Music; Science Fiction

46. Music

Although music performs important political functions, it has long been marginalized or excluded from mainstream approaches to the study of politics. There are at least three overlapping reasons why political scientists have not paid more attention to music. First, politics is typically defined in terms of rational, self-interested behavior or, to quote Harold Lasswell's (1936) famous phrase, "who gets what, when, and how." By comparison, music prompts emotional and often visceral responses. In addition to the verbal messages of song lyrics, music communicates its meanings through non- or extra-linguistic melodies and rhythms. In *The Music of Reason: Rousseau, Nietzsche, Plato*, Michael Davis asks the relevant question:

How are we to speak about what resists being spoken? Such a *logos* seems to us *alogos* – absurd. In the diminished sense of reason that we customarily employ, it seems a reason not altogether rational. But perhaps our unease is an indication not of a problem of reason but rather of the poverty and partiality of our understanding of reason. (2020, 10–11)

Music as critical political science refuses to define politics as narrowly rational and explores the possibility of another reason in politics. In addition to "rationality," politics involves affective, corporeal, performative, and symbolic actions – all of which are aspects of musical experience. The critical theorist, Theodor Adorno famously regarded "music as a language, but a language without concepts" (2012, 8).

Second, according to Max Weber, "a state is a human community that (successfully) claims *the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force* within a given territory" (Gerth and Mills 1946, 78). The study of mainstream politics typically emphasizes state institutions and the power relations within and between them. American political science, in particular, has focused its attention on electoral campaigns for political office. Again, by comparison, music may appear to be extra-institutional and mere entertainment or, at most, "infopolitainment" (Warner 2016). Yet, state-sponsored cultural projects use music for activities ranging from political propaganda to political torture. States also

establish policies that impact the arts, including legal decisions about censorship, FCC regulations on broadcasting, and funding (or the lack thereof) for music education and broadband access. Further, the music industry often mirrors the processes associated with the selection of political leaders, formation of public opinion, and reliance on established experts. For examples, the star system promotes top performers, ratings charts compile listener preferences, and music critics write opinion columns (Street 2011). Music as critical political science recognizes the power of music to shape what Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer lament as a "mass culture" that offers its citizen consumers only commodified sameness. Critical political science also examines forms of cultural or interpretive sovereignty beyond state control, including the diverse forms of cultural expression that mainstream politics excludes (Carpenter 2008; Mattern 1997). Critical theorists concerned with the problem of mass culture have long recognized the importance of cultural sovereignty, including music, as a site of aesthetic resistance for exploited, marginalized, and oppressed peoples (Marcuse 1978). Some also explore how literature and the arts can develop citizens' critical capacities for effective participation in the public sphere (Habermas 1989). A crucial question here is "To what degree will political and economic elites continue to fashion the world, both materially and symbolically, in their own interests, and to what degree can activists harness the arts and popular culture to shatter this hegemony and challenge elite power?" (Love and Mattern 2016, 4).

Third, politics is typically defined as public activity and musical preferences are often regarded as matters of private taste. To define music as an aesthetic object experienced in prescribed settings, for example, a paid performance by classical musicians in a concert hall, reinforces distinctions between high art and pop culture as well as the illusion of "autonomous art." The concept of art as beautiful objects can also stigmatize innovative and non-western forms of artistic expression. Marshall McLuhan (1994) has argued that "great artworks" maintain their status through this contrast with popular art, including the promise that the latter may eventually achieve such elevated status. Further, the concept of autonomous art denies the everyday functions art performs, such as "catalyzing the

imagination, expressing creativity, integrating aspects of the self, providing meaningful symbols, sustaining a sense of beauty and harmony, and, most important here, resisting conformity and subverting the status quo” (Love and Mattern 2016, 5). To counter these perceptions of music as an art object, Christopher Small proposes referring instead to “musicking.” Small (1998, 9) writes,

To music is to take part, in any capacity, in a musical performance, whether by performing, by listening, by rehearsing or practicing, by providing material for performance (what is called composing), or by dancing. We might at times even extend its meaning to what the person is doing who takes the tickets at the door or the hefty men who shift the piano and the drums or the roadies who set up the instruments and carry out the sound checks or the cleaners who clean up after everyone else has gone. They, too, are all contributing to the nature of the event that is a musical performance.

When music is recontextualized as musicking, its socio-economic and political functions become clearer. Music becomes part of a larger music scene or social soundscape and a site for political participation, rather than merely an object for personal consumption. According to Small, music not only creates relationships between “organized sounds” but also “between people, the natural world, and possibly even the supernatural.”

In sum, music as critical political science engages with another, deeper rationality, expands analyses of the state and power relations, reveals the dangers of mass culture, provides sites of cultural and political resistance, and models alternative relationships between humans and other realities. We turn next to the different ways in which music performs these functions at different levels of politics, that is, how music shapes electoral politics, social movements, and political identities.

Campaign theme songs

More than background context or warm-up bands at rallies and speeches, campaign theme songs play important roles in electoral politics. In addition to the emotional charge campaign songs can give a candidate or party, they serve as mnemonic devices, reinforcing name recognition, providing information on

policies, and creating positive associations. Musical sounds are experienced first in the most primitive regions of the brain, the amygdala, cerebellum, and hippocampus, before their lyrics reach the cerebral cortex for cognitive processing. Listeners retain the memories associated with songs long after their cognitive meanings have faded. This makes music a powerful tool for schoolteachers (remember the alphabet song and counting songs) and political candidates alike (Levitin 2006). To return to Small and “musicking,” campaign theme songs can also turn constituents into participants in political campaigns. Choosing songs and singing together create a sense of shared purpose for a campaign that overcomes individual and group feelings of isolation, resistance, and/or reluctance.

Although electoral politics uses music in all of these ways, some changes have occurred historically in campaign theme songs. In *Don't Stop Thinking About the Music, The Politics of Songs and Musicians in Presidential Campaigns* (2012), Benjamin S. Schoenig and Eric T. Kaspar trace that history. The earliest use of music in elections involved victory songs, such as “God Save Washington” and “Follow Washington,” to unify the new nation behind its first president. “Tippecanoe and Tyler, Too” in 1840 was arguably the first campaign theme song for a presidential race. Early campaign songs were distributed on printed broadsheets to be sung by those who attended the candidate’s rallies. Later campaign songs and then videos would be broadcast on the radio, television, and streamed on social media. Along with technology, the composition of these songs changed from adding lyrics to familiar tunes to writing songs and lyrics for particular candidates and most recently to repurposing popular songs for specific campaigns. The “borrowing” or “stealing” of popular music by candidates has become a source of legal controversy with some musicians disavowing candidates, writing “cease and desist” letters, and suing campaigns for the inappropriate use of their songs (Kaspar and Schoenig 2016). In addition, candidates often choose songs to amp up their crowds without exploring the lyrics or the politics of the musicians. A famous example is Ronald Reagan’s unfortunate choice of Bruce Springsteen’s “Born in the USA.” More recently, Queen told Donald Trump, who walked on stage at the 2016 RNC convention to “We Are the

Champions,” to stop using the song (Oliver 2016). However, candidates and their constituents often benefit from endorsing or choosing songs that support their message. For example, in 2016 Hillary Clinton associated herself with Katie Perry’s “Roar” and the DNC sponsored Elizabeth Bank’s montage “This is Our Fight Song” (Rogness 2018). Hillary was also known for crowd sourcing her song choices, offering her supporters a chance to participate in her campaign by selecting her music. When Obama released his personal play list, his supporters also welcomed the inclusive gesture. Yet social media has also increased the possibility of unauthorized songs becoming associated with campaigns. Will.i.am’s “Yes, We Can” produced unofficially for Obama in 2008 was later officially adopted by the campaign. However, the Obama campaign also disavowed the more problematic unauthorized song, Obama Girl’s “I’ve Got a Crush on Obama.” As this suggests, the internet is a space over which candidates and their campaigns have only limited control.

Social movement music

Social movements also use music for a variety of purposes which are succinctly summarized by Reebee Garofalo: “survival/identity, resistance/opposition, consciousness-raising/education, agitation/mobilization” (1992, 2). Movements across the political spectrum use protest songs, most commonly folk or rock songs, to support their efforts. In 1966, R. Serge Denishoff developed the now classic definition of a protest song: “(1) The song attempts to solicit and arouse outside support and sympathy for a social or political movement; (2) the song reinforces the value structure of individuals who are active supporters of the social movement or ideology; (3) the song creates and promotes cohesion, solidarity, and high morale in an organization or movement supporting its world view; (4) the song is an attempt to recruit individuals for a specific social movement; (5) the song invokes solutions to real or imagined social phenomena in terms of action to achieve a desired goal; (6) the song points to some problem or discontent in the society, usually in emotional terms” (qtd. in Garratt 2019, 132). According to James Garratt, protest songs so-defined perform external- (1 and 4) and internal- (2 and 3) facing functions for

social movements; they also serve the more familiar purpose of identifying social problems and proposing solutions to them (5 and 6) (2019, 132–3). Denishoff distinguishes two basic types of protest songs: magnetic songs recruit new members and build community for a movement and rhetorical songs tell stories of individual dissatisfaction and dissent. Although these distinct song types have different features, for example, magnetic songs often involve “call and response” group singing and rhetoric songs typically tell a personal story as a musical ballad, they can also overlap in the consciousness-raising and educational functions they perform for a movement (Denishoff 1983).

Protest songs were originally associated with labor organizing in the early twentieth century. However, it was not until the 1960s that they captured mainstream media and public attention. The anti-war, civil rights, environmental, and feminist movements of the sixties all featured protest songs, and sometimes used the same songs (Garofalo 1992; Love 2006; Pedelty 2012). For example, Martin Luther King learned “We Shall Overcome” at Highlander Folk School and made it the “anthem” of the 1960s civil rights movement, but it has a longer history as a gospel song that was used in 1940s labor protests by striking tobacco workers in North Carolina. Contemporary social movements continue to use protest songs, though often in new ways. Music played a central role in Occupy and prominent musicians, such as Russell Simmons and Tom Morello, supported the movement. The music of Occupy mirrored the diversity of the movement. Instead of featuring a single anthem, Occupy embraced many genres, performers, and songs. Celebrities and superstars were welcome, but not celebrated; the Occupy fundraiser CD had 99 songs, mostly DIY. Occupy also engaged a new generation of listeners on social media (Bauder 2011; Boczanowski 2011; Caren and Gabby 2011; McKinley 2011). Black Lives Matter also drew on the intergenerational history of music as source of Black community and resistance (Reagon 2001). According to Daphne Brooks, Black Lives Matter has now generated a “new wave of black pop protest music [that] captures and grapples with racial catastrophe in the 21st century: the prison-industrial complex, globalised wealth inequality and the violent expendi-

ture of women and children” (2016, n.p.). Kendrick Lamar’s “AlRight” and Beyoncé’s “Formation” are prominent examples of this new generation of Black protest music. Although protest songs are more typically associated with progressive social movements, the Alt Right has also developed a distinctive genre of protest music, Fashwave, with its subgenre, Trumpwave (Love under contract). This electronic, instrumental, sometimes ambient music originates from the synthwave and vaporwave of the 1980s, which some supporters see “as halcyon days, as the last days of white America” (Bullock and Kerry 2017). Others trace the music back further to the 1920s Futurist movement and Muzak from the 1930s. One alt right leader says of Fashwave, “The music is the spirit of the childhoods of millennials ... Our souls are wrapped up in these sounds ... It is the sound of revolution. Our revolution” (Anglin 2016). A common thread running through these right- and left-wing social movements is that their music invokes longer traditions of protest. Indeed, Eyerman and Jamison (1998) argue that protest songs persist in the political culture long after social movements disappear from the political stage. The music of social movements remains ready to remobilize movement supporters when circumstances permit.

National, international, and post-national anthems

Musical compositions have long been associated with sovereign territories through national anthems and other state-sponsored songs. In general terms, anthems are songs of loyalty and devotion, often with religious or quasi-religious meanings and an antiphonal (call and response) structure. In his *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*, Benedict Anderson writes,

there is a special kind of contemporaneous community which language alone suggests – above all in the form of poetry and song. Take national anthems, for example, sung on national holidays. No matter how banal the words and mediocre the tunes, there is in this singing an experience of simultaneity. At precisely such moments, people wholly unknown to each other utter the same verses to the same melody. The image: unisonance. (2016, 145)

In *Music and Social Life, The Politics of Participation*, Thomas Turino (2008) uses Gramsci’s concept of cultural hegemony to analyse the Nazis’ use of music as propaganda. Hitler celebrated Wagner’s music for its “Germanness,” while Goebbels classified “Jewish music” as “degenerate” and stigmatized jazz for its African rhythms. The Nazis also used group singing to build German community, especially among youth, and produced multiple versions of Nazi songbooks for this purpose. Although seldom acknowledged, Hitler modelled the Nazi concentration camps on late nineteenth-century US policies toward Native Americans, specifically the reservation system. Official and unofficial national anthems in the United States often express this dominant ethos of settler colonialism. Consider the “Star-Spangled Banner” with its celebration of militarism during the War of 1812 and “America the Beautiful” with its vision of *terra nullis*, as well as folk and country examples, such as Woody Guthrie’s “This Land is Your Land” and Toby Keith’s “American Ride.”

Of course, anthems are not limited to patriotic songs that celebrate colonial conquests and state sovereignty. There are also anthems of resistance, among the most famous historically, the Communist “Internationale,” the IWWs “Ballad of Joe Hill,” and the Black National Anthem, “Lift Every Voice and Sing.” Some protest songs, such as “We Shall Overcome” and “AlRight,” have also attained the status of anthems. What distinguishes these anthems from other protest songs is their enduring capacity to express the shared identities and continued struggles of a diasporic people. Unlike campaign theme songs associated with electoral politics or protest songs that mobilize social movements, anthems express the contested politics of national, international, and post-national borders and identities. In this respect, anthems can also serve hegemonic and counter-hegemonic functions. Music as propaganda can be used to coopt popular consent, but it can also consolidate forces of resistance.

Closing

Although music as critical political science emphasizes popular songs, instrumental and classical music with its more ambiguous and unspoken meanings can also play a role in politics. In addition to the Nazis’ use of

Wagner's music, Igor Shostakovich is known for the "secret dissonance" encoded in his Fifth and Seventh Symphonies composed during the Soviet era (Garratt 2019, 158). Ludwig von Beethoven's earlier *Der glorreiche Augenblick* cantata has been interpreted as a tribute to absolute monarchy (Garratt 2019). His Ninth Symphony, specifically, its "Ode to Joy," also has a complex and varied political history (Buch and Miller 2004). Susan McClary has analysed the librettos of well-known operas from a feminist perspective and asked why the dramatic story line so often ends with the death of a woman (McClary 2002). Prominent political theorists also composed classical music, including Rousseau's operas and Nietzsche's piano sonatas. As these closing examples suggest, perhaps more important than the specific messages and functions of music in politics is the general recognition that all aspects of society, including the arts and culture, can be politicized. This awareness may be the primary contribution of music as critical political science.

NANCY S. LOVE

References

- Adorno, Theodor. 2012. "Music and Language: A Fragment." In *Quasi Una Fantasia: Essays on Modern Music*, translated by Rodney Livingstone, 1–8. London: Verso.
- Anderson, Benedict. 2016. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso.
- Anglin, Andrew. 2016. "The Official Soundtrack of the Alt Right." *Daily Stormer*, August 13. <https://dailystormer.su/the-official-soundtrack-of-the-alt-right/>
- Bauder, David. 2011. "Occupy Wall Street: Music Central to Protest." *The Huffington Post*, November 13.
- Boczanowski, Zosia. 2011. "The Occupy Movement and Music." *Music Business Journal* (December).
- Brooks, Daphne A. 2016. "How #BlackLivesMatter Started a Musical Revolution." *The Guardian*, March 13.
- Buch, Esteban and Richard Miller. 2004. *Beethoven's Ninth: A Political History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bullock, Penn and Eli Kerry. 2017. "Trumpwave and Fashwave are Just the Latest Disturbing Examples of the Far-Right Appropriating Electronic Music." *Vice*, January 30.
- Caren, Neal and Sarah Gaby. 2011. "Occupy Online: Facebook and the Spread of Occupy Wall Street." Unpublished manuscript.
- Carpenter, Kristin A. 2008. "Interpretive Sovereignty: A Research Agenda." *American Indian Law Review* 33: 111–50.
- Davis, Michael. 2020. *The Music of Reason: Rousseau, Nietzsche, Plato*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Denishoff, R. Serge. 1983. *Sing a Song of Social Significance*. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green Popular Press.
- Eyerman, Ron and Andrew Jamison. 1998. *Music and Social Movements: Mobilizing Traditions in the 20th Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Garofalo, Reebee. 1992. "Introduction." In *Rockin' the Boat: Mass Music and Mass Movements*, edited by Reebee Garofalo, 1–14. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Garratt, James. 2019. *Music and Politics: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1989. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, translated by Thomas Burger with the assistance of Frederick Lawrence. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.
- Horkheimer, Max and Theodor Adorno. 2007. *The Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*, edited by Guenzelin Schmid Noerr, translated by Edmund Jephcott. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Kaspar, Eric T. and Benjamin S. Schoening. 2016. "'I Won't Back Down' or Will I: The Law and Politics Surrounding Presidential Candidates Unauthorized Use of Campaign Theme Songs," in "Symposium: The Art of Elections," edited by Nancy S. Love, 53–68. *PS: Political Science and Politics* (January).
- Lasswell, Harold D. 1936. *Politics: Who Gets What, When, How*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Levitin, Daniel. 2006. *This Is Your Brain on Music: The Science of a Human Obsession*. New York: Dutton, 2006.
- Love, Nancy. 2006. *Musical Democracy*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Love, Nancy. 2024 (under contract). "Music and Right-Wing Extremism Today." In *The Cambridge Companion to Music and Fascism*, edited by Ben Earle and Nicholas Attfield. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Love, Nancy S. and Mark Mattern, eds. 2016. *Doing Democracy: Activist Art and Cultural Politics*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Marcuse, Herbert and Erica Sherover. 1978. *The Aesthetic Dimension: Toward a Critique of Marxist Aesthetics*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Mattern, Mark. 1997. *Acting in Concert: Music, Community, Political Action*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- McClary, Susan. 2002. *Feminine Endings: Music, Gender, and Sexuality*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- McKinley, James C. 2011. "Occupy Wall Street Protest Lacks an Anthem." *New York Times*, October 18.
- McLuhan, Marshall. 1994. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.
- Oliver, John. 2016. "Campaign Songs: Last Week Tonight with John Oliver." July 25. Available at www.youtube.com/watch?v=32n4h0kn-88.
- Pedelt, Mark. 2012. *Ecomusicology: Rock, Folk, and the Environment*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Reagon, Bernice Johnson. 2001. *If You Don't Go, Don't Hinder Me: The African American Sacred Song Tradition*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Rogness, Kate Zitlow. 2018. "This is Our Fight Song." In *You Shook Me All Campaign Long: Music in the 2016 Presidential Campaign and Beyond*, edited by Eric T. Kaspar and Benjamin S. Schoening, 215–38. Denton, TX: University of North Texas Press.
- Schoening, Benjamin S. and Eric T. Kaspar. 2012. *Don't Stop Thinking About the Music: The Politics of Songs and Musicians in Presidential Campaigns*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Small, Christopher. 1998. *Musicking: The Meanings of Performing and Listening*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.
- Street, John. 2011. *Music and Politics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Turino, Thomas. 2008. *Music as Social Life: The Politics of Participation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Warner, Jamie. 2016. "The Smugglers: The Rationality of Political Satire in the 2014 Elections." *PS: Political Science and Politics*. 49 (January): 48–52.
- Weber, Max. 1946. "Politics as a Vocation." In *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, edited and translated by Hans H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, 77–128. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

PART II

CRITICAL JOURNALS

47. Capitalism, nature, socialism

Concerns over the environmental destructiveness of capitalism are long-standing and have been expressed in a variety of ways. In capitalist countries, socialists rarely addressed environmental issues and those who did tended to be politically marginal. The 1960s saw the development and spread of a form of environmentalism that was centred mainly in middle-income white communities and it was at first met with scepticism, especially among Marxists. However, by the 1980s, increasing dissatisfaction with state-socialist environmental records spurred some Western Marxists to revisit and question canonical texts and the history of socialism to formulate new ways of reconciling environmental issues with the diverse demands voiced through movements struggling against multiple forms of oppression.

Among them were members of a collective that included faculty, students, and independent researchers at the University of California at Santa Cruz. Under the leadership of James O'Connor and Barbara Laurence, the journal *Capitalism Nature Socialism (CNS)* was founded in 1988 and, importantly, the collective included a materialist Ecofeminist current. The journal project came into being as a non-profit organization, set up by Laurence and O'Connor, called the Center for Political Ecology (www.centerforpolitecal ecology.org/). The Center serves as *CNS*'s official owner and enables it to raise funds to support the publishing process.

The idea for the journal arose from a formal seminar as well as from informal meetings. The seminar and meetings, as well as the journal's founding, were prompted by the realization that historically the left had been giving scant, if any, attention to the ecological crisis and to theorizing people-environment relations. The seminar participants found a similar situation obtaining in academia, trade unions, and in formal politics, where environmentalist struggles were finding little support or even resistance to those struggles. They resolved, through the seminar, to formulate research questions on this theme and to undertake the challenging process of critically revisiting the very foundations of most leftist movements, including Marxism.

The ensuing seminar discussions and debates led to the idea of establishing a journal where such ideas could continue being exchanged among interested scholars. This was an important decision because there was a dearth of academic outlets, including in Political Science, that were open to the development of socialist environmentalist or ecological Marxist perspectives or to formulating new ideas and alternatives to capitalist social and environmental relations (O'Connor 1988).

One of the primary aims of the journal was to contribute to the development of a leftist environmental politics. This meant, from the start, that the journal was no mere scholarly critique from afar, but promoted direct engagement with, if not direct involvement in political struggles. In fact, some of the participants, most of whom formed the backbone of the journal over the early years, were in the thick of political action, including O'Connor and Laurence. Many were actively involved in environmental, socialist, and/or feminist formations. Others positioned themselves in purely academic institutions, or they worked in both activist and academic worlds simultaneously. The seminar participant, and subsequently the journal editors, came from different social contexts and brought diverse perspectives to the discussions. Noteworthy was the mixed social science backgrounds of those involved in the seminar and then in the journal. This readily imprinted an enduring interdisciplinary character to the journal, inclusive of Political Science and affine subfields, like Political Anthropology, Political Geography, and Political Sociology.

Some of the journal's founders had linkages to, or came from, countries other than the United States, including countries in Central and South America and Western and Central Europe. An international network was thereby built into the journal, which facilitated the international diffusion of ideas and debates as well as international distribution of the journal. Those early international connections eventuated in the founding of associated publications and collaborative editorships in other countries and in other languages by the early 1990s. Thus, several journals were eventually set up to establish a network of scholars and activists sharing the same objectives as those in *CNS*. These included the Catalan/Spanish *Ecología Política* (www.ecologiapolitica.info), the Italian *Capitalismo Natura Socialismo* (now archived under the

name of *Ecologia Politica: Ricerche per l'Alternativa* [Political Ecology: Research for the Alternative], www.ecologiapolitica.org, and the French *Écologie Politique* (www.ecologie-et-politique.info). The editorial overlaps facilitated coordination among the journals, including devoting attention to the same themes within the same year as well as re-publishing articles in their different respective languages. By the early 2000s, however, as editorship composition and priorities shifted among the collaborating journals, the network eventually dissolved, only to be partially re-engaged through occasional shared projects based more on personal connections.

Nevertheless, *CNS* continues the policy of involving researchers and activists outside North America and of promoting and supporting the work of scholars and scholar-activists who write in languages other than English, including via translations. These policies are fortified by the purposeful inclusion of issues and debates relevant to places and regions outside of North America. It was with this understanding as well that a book series was put together, publishing the works of Enrique Leff (1995) and O'Connor (1998) as well as edited volumes on various themes featuring members of the editorial collectives. This initiative allowed for the further and more efficacious diffusion to other parts of the world of the many critical studies, ideas, and political proposals promulgated through the journal. This international presence was and remains a key facet of the journal, in conformity with an internationalist outlook in the quest for egalitarian and ecologically sustainable alternatives to capitalism and in the debates on those very alternatives.

CNS remains close to its starting aims, even if substantial changes have occurred since its founding. Three factors underlie such changes (Engel-Di Mauro 2015). One is the composition of the editorial groups, as new editors took up the posts left by older ones. This eventuated in the abandonment of editorial groups in favor of a structure more akin to the more traditional editorial boards characteristic of most academic journals. Of especial consequence was O'Connor's deteriorating health and passing and that of Joel Kovel, who had taken the reins of the journal by 2003 and bequeathed the honor to the present author in 2012. Another factor is the intensification of publishing pressures,

with the greatest danger to the journal's existence posed by the former publisher's decision to discontinue publishing *CNS*. The switch to another publisher afforded a much greater reach worldwide but meant the demise of the book series and eventually the pricing out of most subscribers. Finally, the much wider and shifting social struggles and intellectual currents over the succeeding decades influenced the journal's trajectory in terms of content as well as a more explicit eco-socialist commitment. The change was in part instituted through an Ecofeminist editorial collective, which has become central to the journal thanks to sustained efforts from the very founding of the journal (see Brownhill and Turner 2019; Mellor 1992; Salleh and O'Connor 1995). Some of the modification in content included the return of poetry, a greater anarchist representation, more publications on issues pertaining to China and Venezuela, as well as the notion of socialist eco-civilization, and the expansion of the reviews section to literature and the arts. The decision to make evident *CNS*'s eco-socialist commitment was on account of some worldwide developments (mainly the emergence of eco-socialist movements) and some editors' involvement in organizations like the World Social Forum and the Ecosocialist International Network (Kovel 2008).

In approach, the journal was and remains a non-sectarian leftist publication that welcomes contributions from the wide gamut of socialist currents, including anarchist ones. To summarize from the journal's official aims and scope statement, the principal editors' remit is to promote and support broadly socialist critical scholarship and activism on people-environment relations and the ecological crisis, with an especially keen eye on writings that advance the cause of building an ecologically sustainable class- and state-free social order. Within such remit is to favor and facilitate the gathering of leftist and environmentalist frameworks within and beyond academia.

The task of the journal and its corollary activities is to develop a red-green framework so as to contribute to the building of intellectual currents capable of responding to the ecological crisis and the role of the left in addressing it (Kovel 1994). However, there are widely different histories and divergences, even incompatibilities, among leftist

movements and the same can be said of environmentalism. For instance, it is tough to imagine alliances among Deep Ecology groups and Autonomist Marxists, but the effort is nevertheless important. *CNS* is among the first, at least in the Anglophone academic world, to attempt to bring together two broad movements that until recently were hardly on speaking terms with each other or were at times reciprocally dismissive. To construct the basis for a permanent dialogue among those groups has not been easy and it remains a major challenge. Nevertheless, judging from outcomes so far, it could be said that the journal has become an important reference point for those seeking a leftist environmentalism and a conduit for the expansion of leftist movements' horizons. At the same time, the journal has become a support for otherwise marginalized leftist voices to gain academic legitimacy as well as a forum for leftist currents searching for a way to reinvent themselves relative to the challenges of the ecological crisis and of the perceived ecological and social failures of state socialism (Engel-Di Mauro 2021).

In fact, among the main rationales for the journal's existence was from the beginning the necessity to explain what happened in countries like the USSR. This has been achieved by bringing to prominence the ecologically constructive impacts of socialist states, often conveniently omitted or cited dismissively, and by contextualizing socialist states in the wider dynamics of the capitalist world economy and in the multi-faceted internal social struggles that incised the histories of state-socialist countries (for examples, see Gare 1993 and 2012; Gille 1997; Levins 2005; O'Connor 1989; Rosset and Benjamin 1994; The New York *CNS* Editorial Group 2002). In this manner, the journal questions the very basis of much of conventional Political Science, often underpinned by liberal democratic triumphalism, overwhelmed by variants of bourgeois ideology, and mired in formalism and state-centric, often Eurocentric, notions of democracy and politics generally. In this respect, *CNS* constitutes a still rare and scientifically rigorous counterbalance to mainstream political science within the Anglophone university.

SALVATORE ENGEL-DI MAURO

References

- Brownhill, Leigh, and Terisa E. Turner. 2019. "Ecofeminism at the Heart of Ecosocialism." *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 30, no. 1: 1–10.
- Engel-Di Mauro, Salvatore. 2015. "A More than Twenty-Fifth Anniversary for More than a Journal." *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 25, no. 1: 1–9.
- Engel-Di Mauro, Salvatore. 2021. *State Socialism and the Environment*. London: Pluto Press.
- Gare, Arran. 1993. "Soviet Environmentalism: The Path not Taken." *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 4, no. 4: 69–88.
- Gare, Arran. 2012. "China and the Struggle for Ecological Civilization." *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 23, no. 4: 10–26.
- Gille, Zsuzsa. 1997. "Two Pairs of Women's Boots for a Hectare of Land: Nature and the Construction of the Environmental Problem in State Socialism." *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 8, no. 4: 1–21.
- Kovel, Joel. 1994. "Red Green Politics in the United States?" *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 5, no. 4: 1–4.
- Kovel, Joel. 2008. "The EIN." *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 19, no. 1: 1–4.
- Leff, Enrique. 1995. *Green Production: Toward an Environmental Rationality*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Levins, Richard. 2005. "How Cuba Is Going Ecological." *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 16, no. 3: 7–25.
- Mellor, Mary. 1992. "Eco-Feminism and Eco-Socialism: Dilemmas of Essentialism and Materialism." *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 3, no. 2: 43–62.
- O'Connor, James. 1988. "Prospectus. Capitalism, Nature, Socialism. A Journal of Socialist Ecology." *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 1, no. 1: 1–6.
- O'Connor, James. 1989. "Political Economy of Ecology of Socialism and Capitalism." *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 1, no. 3: 93–107.
- O'Connor, James. 1998. *Natural Causes: Essays in Ecological Marxism*. New York: Guilford.
- Rosset, Peter, and Medea Benjamin. 1994. "Cuba's Nationwide Conversion to Organic Agriculture." *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 5, no. 3: 79–97.
- Salleh, Ariel, and Martin O'Connor. 1991. "Eco-Socialism/Eco-Feminism." *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 2, no. 1: 129–37.
- The New York *CNS* Editorial Group. 2002. "Introduction to the Symposium: Socialism and Ecology." *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 13, no. 3: 49–51.

48. *Critical Sociology*

The journal *Critical Sociology* publishes scholarship that is informed by historical materialism as broadly represented by Marx and Marxism. The journal seeks to engage and promote critical thinking by publishing articles from all perspectives broadly defined as falling within the boundaries of critical or radical social science. The journal invites scholars who seek to make problematic existing social relations to uncover underlying structural forces informing how our society operates. A critical sociological approach can be applied to all areas of inquiry and is not itself a subfield within mainstream sociology. Advocates of a critical sociology argue that mainstream sociology is governed by an acceptance of a dominant (in this case capitalist) set of relationships that appear to be natural outcomes of human interaction. Those operating outside traditional norms are treated as aberrations or their failures are self-induced. For critical sociologists, the key is how the norms are defined and what constitutes actions by individuals who violate norms. Where mainstream sociology would see a plane flying out of formation, critical sociology asks whether the formation is flying off course in the first instance, and who or what determines the shape and course of that formation.

As a result, *Critical Sociology* seeks contributions that bridge many disciplinary boundaries because critical analyses question the very premises of those boundaries. For example, mainstream economics considers poverty a byproduct of either individual failings or exogenous forces disrupting the normal course of economic activities. In contrast, a critical perspective argues that poverty is a systemic outcome of market economies creating inequalities and immiseration. Similarly, a critical political science challenges conventional ideas of political freedom and liberty, of citizenship and human rights. Political emancipation, for Marx, is an illusion and cannot be equated with human emancipation (Brenkert 1986). Indeed, Marx goes on to argue that political emancipation is merely a right to non-interference of the state on an individual, but a politically free state does not ensure that an individual will be free (Engle 2008):

Political emancipation is, at the same time, the dissolution of the old society on which the state alienated from the people, the sovereign power, is based. What was the character of the old society? It can be described in one word – *feudalism*. The character of the old civil society was directly *political* – that is to say, the elements of civil life, for example, property, or the family, or the mode of labor, were raised to the level of elements of political life in the form of seignior, estates, and corporations. (Marx 1843; emphasis in the original)

Setting the stage

For over two decades following the end of World War II, America was a beacon of prosperity, an engine of middle-class achievements and growth, and a model for the rest of the world. Europe rebuilt after the devastation of that war. Japan transformed itself as a modern industrial powerhouse, and social mobility in the New World was held up as a paragon of opportunities when compared to rigid class structures in the Old World. But by the latter part of the 1960s the cracks in that veneer began to reveal ugly truths about the United States.

Racial inequality spilled out into violent rebellion in the predominantly poor Black city centers. In July 1964, a police officer shot and killed a 15-year-old African American boy resulting first in protest marches and eventually in several nights of violence and rebellion throughout New York City's predominantly Black neighborhoods of Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant. The next summer police used force on a young Black man for allegedly driving under the influence, and soon the gathering of silent bystanders turned in the Watts riot of 1965 ending with the imposition of martial law. In July 1967, police arrested and beat up a black taxi driver in Newark, a crowd gathered and soon rage turned into violence. That same month police in Detroit raided an after-hours bar in a poor Black neighborhood arresting 80 people, a crowd gathered, and once more frustration with poverty, unemployment, and a sense of police harassment turned the city into another war zone resulting in the use of the National Guard to patrol the streets. Systemic racism and the legacy of slavery boiled up in violent protest at a time when leaders of the Black community were being killed: Medgar Evers in June 1963, Malcolm X in February 1965,

and Martin Luther King murdered in April 1968.

The decades following World War II also heralded major international changes as former colonies resisted European colonialism. During the war years, European (and American) companies' focus on Latin America waned, but when the war ended a return to the old "Monroe Doctrine" reasserted America's interests on the continent. From 1953 to 1966, the U.S. provided \$1.136 billion in military assistance (material and training) to Latin America establishing bases and supporting governments friendly to U.S. interests (Klare 2007). With U.S. military assistance, the 1950 independence demonstrations in Puerto Rico were suppressed. U.S. troops were involved in conflicts in Panama in 1958, a U.S. sponsored invasion of Cuba failed in 1961, and there was direct military involvement in the Dominican Republic and Guatemala from 1965–1967. The failure of the French to retain its hold over its colonies in "Indo-China" culminated in the 1954 French defeat at Dien Bien Phu. There followed a civil war between nationalists in the North and U.S. allies in South Vietnam. Anti-Communist U.S. foreign policies, and the fear of another confrontation with China after the Korean War, resulted first in providing military aid and advisers to the South, and by 1961 increased direct military involvement with "boots on the ground" in an unpopular war.

1968, Summer in America

Protests by Anti-Vietnam War activists, student demonstrators and a growing militancy in the Black communities converged during the Democratic National Convention in Chicago which led to the police riot on August 28, 1968. At the same time, Wilbur Ross, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare presented a keynote address at the annual American Sociological Association meeting held in Boston to be followed by commentary from a representative of the Radical Caucus, a product of the New University Conference. Opposition to mainstream academics that many graduate students saw as systematic and uncritical support for American social, economic, and foreign policies resulted in similar caucuses forming at that time in several disciplines: the Union for Radical Political Economics

(URPE), a radical caucus in the Modern Language Association, the Caucus for a New Political Science, and Planners for Equal Opportunities, among others (Ross 2010). Events right before and after the ASA challenged doctrinaire sociology culminating in the Sociology Liberation Movement that produced a newsletter challenging conventional wisdom and this newsletter soon morphed into a self-published journal, *The Insurgent Sociologist*.

These early insurgents challenged a discipline which did not give voice to critics, producing scholarship that took to task conventional wisdom. They rejected a liberal narrative that took for granted the bounty of society, while ignoring the labor, exploitation, and tyranny that made that bounty possible and was reserved for only some sectors of society. Articles on the nature of elitism and democracy, on self-imposed constraints on scholars as activists, on power structures in society, on the way credentialism advances those who adhere to dominant paradigms and punish critics, and a criticism of a discipline that is willing to study social problems without doing much to change the society appeared in the first issues of this new journal. The third issue of the journal presented several essays outlining the scope of this radical sociology and called for insurgency versus sociology to change America's basic institutions. Sociology as then defined was a discipline that apologizes for, rationalizes, and supports a system that maintains injustice and inequities. In short, to paraphrase Marx, sociologists should not just study society, but work to change it. The contents of *The Insurgent Sociologist* over the next several years included a regular account of how radical sociologists fared in sociology departments, of tenure denials, on the difficulty of finding an outlet for serious research challenging mainstream sociology, and on why critical theories are crucial if there is to be a vibrant and relevant sociology discipline.

As the insurgent graduate students and early career faculty advanced through their career ladders *The Insurgent Sociologist* increasingly published scholarship that was the product of the political and intellectual ferment of the time, promoting a vision of a different world, and arguing that sociology offered the tools for its implementation. Increasingly it became the outlet for

developing critical and radical scholarship unwelcomed in most departments and the discipline's journals. The *Insurgent* was more than an alternative academic voice as it socialized an entire generation of aspiring sociologists by providing a place for those who felt marginalized by the sociology mainstream. The review process gave constructive criticism to authors while also developing a new and "radical" sociology that could better explain the complexities of advanced capitalism. The impact of *The Insurgent Sociologist* and its contributors on mainstream sociology was greater than one might have expected, and its main organization, the American Sociological Association (ASA), incorporated much of radical sociology becoming transformed from a monolithic homogenous representation of sociology into the more heterogeneous discipline it had become by the 1980s. Radical sociology ceased to be "insurgent" as issues of race, class, gender, and even Marxism were discussed at annual meetings and articles appeared in academic journals. In a transforming academic climate with a different political context, *The Insurgent Sociologist* changed its name in 1987 to *Critical Sociology*.

The state of *Critical Sociology*

For the past 20 years, *Critical Sociology* has been one of the leading academic journals that focuses on the historical conditions driving contemporary social outcomes. Examining the nature of the capitalist system informed by a debt to the writings of Marx, critical sociologists along with radical economists and political scientists, have embarked on several lines of inquiry. Articles in the journal over the years reflected the critical engagement of radical scholarship that asked questions about the nature of contemporary capitalism (see Fasenfest 2007). These included:

- What role does capitalism play in defining the nature of production and work, and the resulting class structure?
- How do we understand the character of the state, and on the emergence, role and impact of ideology on the structure of the ruling class?
- Do organizations within capitalism constrain and direct education, social reproduction, and the reproduction of social relations?
- How does society create urban space, what is the impact of public sector fiscal policy, and how (whether) we can anticipate urban crises?
- What is gained as we challenge narratives of international development, the emergence of world systems, post-colonial transitions, and growing inequities between the Global North and South?
- Can we reconcile gender and race with traditional Marxist ideas of class, and how to understand the functioning of intersectionality on contemporary capitalism?

The impact the original insurgents and critical scholars had on the overall discipline is undeniable. Some have risen to become president of the ASA; they have held key positions in other professional organizations, been heads of institutes and department chairs, and are among the ranks of senior faculty in mainstream sociology and related departments. Publishing in *Critical Sociology* has resulted in being awarded tenure, and the journal now increasingly attracts international readers and contributors while providing a platform for exchanging ideas with other traditions and enriching American scholarship. Articles in the journal are downloaded tens of thousands of times each year, and they are increasingly cited in the research of others as the journal's ranking and Impact Factor increases year after year. From its founding by insurgents challenging orthodoxy in the discipline, *Critical Sociology* remains both outside and yet central to the emergence of a vibrant sociology.

DAVID FASENFEST

References

- Brenkert, George G. 1986. Marx and Human Rights, *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 24, no. 1:55–77.
- Engle, Eric. 2008. Human Rights According to Marxism. *Guild Practitioner*, 249–56.
- Fasenfest, David. 2007. "Critical Sociology" In *21st Century Sociology: A Reference Handbook Vol 2*, edited by Clifton D. Bryant and Dennis L. Peck, 17–23. London: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Klare, M. 2007. U.S. Military Operations/Latin America, *NACLA*, September 25, Available at <https://nacla.org/article/us-military-operations-latin-america>.
- Marx, Karl. 1843. *On the Jewish Question*, Available at www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1844/jewish-question/.

Ross, Robert J. S. 2010. "Reflections on the Sociology Liberation Movement of 1968." In *Crisis, Politics and Critical Sociology*, edited by Graham Cassano and Richard A. Dello Buono, 19–26. Leiden, Boston: Brill.

See also

Review of Radical Economics; New Political Science

49. *democracy*

The journal *democracy* was founded in January 1981 by Princeton political theorist Sheldon S. Wolin as “a progressive response to *The Public Interest*” (Nelson 1986, 48) and as a vehicle for intellectuals and political theorists to address a popular readership. The journal’s title was spelled with a lower d as a tribute to Dwight McDonald’s politics, and the publication intended to be “a journal of political renewal and radical change” as stated in its long title. Wolin was the journal’s editor with Nicholas Xenos and Cynthia Perwin Halpern (both former students of Wolin’s) serving as managing editors. The editorial board included Joyce Appleby, Jerry Berman, Lawrence Goodwyn, William Kornhauser, Christopher Lasch, Robert Lekachman, David Noble, and Hanna Pitkin. The journal was published by the Common Good Foundation, whose president Max Palevsky, a computer technology pioneer turned philanthropist and art collector, had initially approached Wolin with the idea of launching a new journal that would make proposals about public policy and represent a left-wing equivalent to the dominant conservative think-tanks (Chavez 2015; Hauptmann 2011).

Wolin welcomed the idea of a journal, but he made clear in his first editorial that he had reservations about the policy orientation Palevsky had envisioned: “Our aim will be to encourage the development of an historical and theoretical understanding around the concrete problems of the present.” Wolin observed that “We cannot offer recipes or specific policies, but we can bring a critical approach that will illuminate what is at stake for the future of democracy in current debates; how specific problems have come to have their present form; and what kinds of broad alternatives, consistent with democracy, are possible” (Wolin 1981a, 4). Wolin’s introductory editorial underscores the critical nature of the publication and its orientation regarding the nature of democracy and its predicaments at the time. As Wolin (1981a, 4) understood it, the “crucial challenge to radical democracy” was “to be as zealous in preventing things of great value to democracy from passing into oblivion as in bringing into the world new political forms of action, participation, and being together.” This populist

posture went together with a denunciation of the “ideology of progress” and a cultivation of memory of things past or, as Wolin (1981a, 4) argued: “radicals cannot leave the past to the conservatives; they need to remind themselves that they, too, have a past rich with democratic experience and wisdom.” After only three years of publication and a total of 12 issues, Palevsky abruptly decided to stop financing the journal and it ceased publication. Launched at the same time as the Reagan presidency, of which it immediately became a critical voice, *democracy* thus failed to exist through the end of the first Reagan mandate.

The journal was mainly written by scholars and it invited contributions by a few European authors (Pierre Vidal-Naquet, Maximilien Rubel, Ivan Illich) and Japanese authors (Tsurumi Shunsuke, Shuichi Kato), but most contributors and most of the themes addressed in the journal centered on the U.S. political experience. Many contributors belonged to Wolin’s inner circles, including former colleagues (Norman O. Brown, Michael Rogin, Hanna Pitkin, Arno Mayer, John Schaar), former students (Peter Euben, Wilson Carey Mc Williams, C. Douglas Lummis, Jeffrey Lustig, Michael Roth, Andrew Polsky), or other close associates (William E. Connolly), with the addition of some prominent voices such as Christopher Lasch, Peter Bachrach, Christopher Hill, and Todd Gitlin. Most articles were commissioned to their authors and the different issues of the journal were organized by themes (such as “The Current Crisis,” January 1981; “Democracy’s State,” April 1981; and so on).

Several explanations have been given for Palevsky’s sudden volte-face and the journal’s demise. According to John G. Gunnell (1986, 129), the failure of *democracy* was due to the “academic prejudice” of its authors against traditional party politics, which falsely entertained hopes that “political change can emerge through the force of ideas and education.” According to that view, *democracy* failed because of its inability to fundamentally engage the political terrain. For Gunnell (1993, 275), the fate of *democracy* “must be viewed as one more example of the traditional dream of American social science to find a way to bridge the gulf between academic and public discourse without fundamentally transforming the scholarly enterprise and without directly entering the distasteful and dangerous world

of partisan politics.” Regardless of the merit of this explanation, it does not explain why the journal folded so suddenly.

An alternative explanation attributes the downfall of *democracy* to the specific form of anti-modernism professed in its pages. Paradoxically, the first article to voice that criticism appeared in the journal itself (Shulman 1983). For Shulman, *democracy* embraced a “populist Republican” position that amounted to a form of “pastoralism,” with a particular inclination towards the local, roots, the past and the authority of shared values. That stance, he argued, where “radicalism becomes a matter more of recovery than of creation” (Shulman 1983, 43), risked alienating urban activists who would otherwise have been natural allies to the journal’s project of radical critique and renewal. In addition, Shulman (1983, 53) argued that the journal had framed the question of renewal in a limited way: “The urban crisis is not only a social question of corporate power, but a cultural question about the form of the good life.” David Plotke (1984) offered a complementary analysis in *Socialist Review* just a few months after *democracy* ceased to exist. Plotke explained the demise of *democracy* in the larger context of the concomitant failure of the Marxist left to offer a credible political critique of the excesses of market capitalism at the beginning of the Reagan era. Like Shulman, Plotke mentioned the strong communal preferences expressed in favor of rootedness in the pages of *democracy*, the publication’s populist dimension, and its hostility to progress as hindrances to tackle structural economic issues more directly. Moreover, the journal’s anti-modernism sometimes risked recycling “the populist rhetoric of neoconservative and new-right intellectuals” (Plotke 1984, 41), with Christopher Lasch (1981, 21) railing against counterculture and its alleged “vision of a society without authority, without fathers, and without a past” or Jean Bethke Elshtain echoing Lasch’s cultural conservatism with a scathing critique of feminist movements (Elshtain 1982). Thus, Plotke (1984) concludes that “democracy’s stance was inadequate. It simplified the process of modernization, relied on a vague notion of community, and offered little account of the sources of the movements that today can be called democratic.”

John S. Nelson (2013, 48) offers an even sharper critique. Nelson observed that the

content of the journal simply lacked quality: “most of the articles lacked imaginative appeal ideas and popular appeal, leading the publisher and financier to pull the plug after a few years.” Nelson’s judgement, however, remains unsubstantiated and it does not account for the merit of several of Wolin’s (1981b; 1982a; 1982b, 1983) own contributions, or for several other articles that did not follow the “pastoral” line mentioned above and that made original and lasting contributions (to name but three from the Fall 1982 issue: Lummis 1982; Bachrach 1982; Pitkin and Schumer 1982). In addition, neither Nelson, Shulman, nor Plotke give credit to *democracy* for the way it attempted to develop a resolutely political approach to a range of questions related to political economy (July 1981), culture (October 1981), the nuclear threat (January 1982), religion (April 1982), party politics (July 1982), technology (Spring 1983), or urban decay (Winter 1983). If a localist and “rooted” bent did dominate the publication, *democracy* nevertheless managed to articulate a critical stance that could have become more influential had its publisher not brutally decided to discontinue his support. Finally, the journal also helped elevate the question of democracy itself to the center of radical and critical perspectives among many political scientists.

OLIVIER ROUCHET

References

- Bachrach, Peter. 1982. “Class Struggle and Democracy.” *Democracy* 2, no. 4 (October): 29–42.
- Chavez, Elisabeth K. 2015. *Reviewing Political Criticism: Journals, Intellectuals, and the State*. New York: Routledge.
- Elshtain, Jean Bethke. 1982. “Antigone’s Daughters.” *democracy* 2, no. 2: 46–59.
- Gunnell, John G. 1986. *Between Philosophy and Politics: The Alienation of Political Theory*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Gunnell, John G. 1993. *The Descent of Political Theory: The Genealogy of an American Vocation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hauptmann, Emily. 2001. “‘Our Highest Aim’: Democracy and the Public Role of the Political Theorist.” Paper Presented at the 2001 Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, held at Chicago, Illinois, April 19–22, 2001.

- Hauptmann, Emily. 2011. "The Development of Philanthropic Interest in the Scientific Study of Political Behavior." Rockefeller Archives Center. Available at www.issuelab.org/resources/27807/27807.pdf.
- Lasch, Christopher. 1981. "Mass Culture Reconsidered." *democracy* 1, no. 4: 7–22.
- Lummis, Charles Douglas. 1982. "The Radicalism of Democracy." *democracy* 2, no. 4: 9–16.
- Nelson, John S. 2013. *Popular Cinema as Political Theory. Idealism and Realism in Epics, Noirs, and Satires*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Pitkin, Hanna F. and Sara M. Schumer. 1982. "On Participation." *democracy* 2, no. 4: 43–54.
- Plotke, David, 1984. "Democracy, Modernization, 'democracy'." *Socialist Review* 14, no. 2: 29–53.
- Shulman, George. 1983. "The Pastoral Idyll of Democracy." *democracy* 3, no. 3: 43–54.
- Wolin, Sheldon S. 1981a. "Why Democracy? Editorial." *democracy* 1, no. 1: 3–5.
- Wolin, Sheldon S. 1981b. "The People's Two Bodies." *democracy* 1, no. 1: 9–24.
- Wolin, Sheldon S. 1982a. "America's Civil Religion." *democracy* 2, no. 2: 7–17.
- Wolin, Sheldon S. 1982b. "What Revolutionary Action Means Today." *democracy* 2, no. 4: 17–28.
- Wolin, Sheldon S. 1983. "From Progress to Modernization: The Conservative Turn." *democracy* 3, no. 3: 9–21.

See also

Sheldon S. Wolin; William E. Connolly; Jeffrey Lustig; Democracy

50. *Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy*

Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy is a highly ranked academic journal which publishes four volumes of double-anonymous peer-reviewed essays each year. It is published by Cambridge University Press. *Hypatia* is governed by a non-profit board, an editor or team of co-editors, and an advisory board made up of a diverse group of scholars of various academic ranks. The journal is intended to foster a diverse range of feminist philosophical work, and welcomes manuscripts written by scholars from many disciplines. *Hypatia* has a long history of publishing ground-breaking thematic special issues in collaboration with guest editors. The journal also publishes smaller thematic clusters and symposia.

Hypatia considers several types of manuscripts for publication. *Articles*, the most frequently published, observe all the standards and conventions for academic publication and are judged by reviewers on the contributions they make to feminist philosophy. Citational practices are considered in the review process and authors are encouraged to adopt an expansive view of what constitutes "relevant literature" on a particular theme. *Musings* are shorter in length and often more personal in style, are less rooted in particular bodies of literature and more concerned with current issues than full-length articles. They are meant to catalyze philosophical reflection on important issues in feminist philosophy. *Interviews* are considered for publication only if they significantly advance the understanding of the work of the interviewee or advance feminist thinking beyond what was previously published by the interviewee. *Book reviews* are invited and published through *Hypatia Reviews Online*, and are not in the journal itself. They introduce *Hypatia*'s audience to recently published books in feminist thought. *Book Review Essays* are published in *Hypatia* proper, must meet similar standards to full-length articles, though typically shorter in length, and include a deeper engagement with a book or a set of books on a specific topic. Finally, *Translations*, the most recent addition to *Hypatia*, is part of a larger "Feminism in Translation" initiative. These are translations into English of articles

previously published in other languages that have had a significant impact on feminist thinking in their home language.

As part of the journal's aspiration to foster a more inclusive, fairer, more capacious philosophical and feminist intellectual life, *Hypatia* prides itself on encouraging a constructive and rigorous review process. Reviewers are encouraged to find what is worthy or promising in a manuscript, to help the author see how that dimension can be fruitfully developed, and to assist the author in identifying what is extraneous or less than promising. This engagement is asked of reviewers whether or not the manuscript is recommended for publication. While the journal only accepts feminist essays, the editors recognize that what counts as "feminist" is itself a contested question and thus the category is open to transformations as our understandings of feminism are revised.

Part I: History and aims

Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy, was the product of a daring and innovative vision nurtured through debate and discussion by the Society for Women in Philosophy (SWIP). Feminist scholarship grew substantially in the 1970s, but feminist philosophers struggled to find a place for their work in existing academic publications. Eventually, members of SWIP acted on the need for a journal that reflected the theoretical and methodological innovations of feminist perspectives. As Kathryn Morgan of Canadian SWIP writes: "the formation of SWIP and the development of *Hypatia* were parts of a movement of women in philosophy from silence into feminist speech and ... from a status of philosophical marginality to a place of public legitimacy that was of our own creation" (Trebilcot 1990, ix).

Reflecting on the years leading up to *Hypatia*, founding editor Azizah al-Hibri (1990, xi) writes that "publishers viewed the launching of a feminist journal as a risk ... some of us feminists simply did not get the message." According to al-Hibri (1990, xi), the cultivation of *Hypatia* required creativity since "the journal had no budget, no staff, and no headquarters ... nothing came easy, despite the nationwide surge of support. We were but a handful of committed women, mostly novices, working against all odds to bring to life SWIP's decade-old dream."

Nonetheless, the founding editorial board carved out and fought for an established space for feminist scholarship and activism.

It was through the wish to acknowledge this history that the journal arrived at its namesake, Hypatia, a woman philosopher, mathematician, and leader of the Neoplatonic School. Hypatia lived in Alexandria from her birth in 370 AD until her brutal death at the hands of a mob of monks while on her way to the academy in 415 AD. In choosing this historical figure, the founding editors hoped to acknowledge a long history of women philosophers, writing in their dedication: “[Hypatia’s] name reminds us that although many of us are the first women philosophers in our schools, we are not after all the first in history” (Wylie 2013, 108). Or, as the current editors have written, the promise of feminism is connected “with the specific histories of women who have refused the things that diminish us. So, there is a past, or there are many pasts, that are born of an aspiration to more bearable futures. We inherit the aspirational promise of feminism and through it we sometimes lift one another up” (Mann et al., 2019, 394).

Eventually, *Hypatia* found its starting point as a special issue of *Women’s Studies International Forum* (WSIF) from 1983 to 1985. The aim of this “piggyback” structure was to show publishers that a journal like *Hypatia* could appeal to a considerable readership. By the third issue, it was clear that *Hypatia* was achieving academic recognition and popularity, and in 1986 the journal published its first autonomous issue. With its independence, the editorial board began the collective and meticulous task of shaping the discipline of feminist philosophy. The founders wrestled with a number of questions: Should *Hypatia* be a journal of feminism and philosophy or a journal of *feminist philosophy*? Should it publish pieces of philosophy that didn’t have explicit feminist themes but were nevertheless written by women? Should *Hypatia* publish articles written by men? How would a journal, undertaken in the feminist spirit, be governed? Perhaps most importantly, how might a feminist standpoint change and shape the culture of philosophy as a discipline (Callahan 2010, 5:45, 27:36–28:00)?

Part II: Scope

From the beginning, one aspiration of the journal was to provide a place where women could publish their work and thereby establish professional legitimacy. The feminist review culture developed by *Hypatia* centered on a commitment to constructive, rigorous reviews and “served feminist goals of political and intellectual empowerment of women and not the death-oriented adversarial models of the patriarchal paradigms” (Trebilcot 1990, ix). The journal embraced a double-anonymous, rigorous peer-review process early on, and quickly gained recognition as a serious journal, eventually becoming a highly sought-after publication venue for scholars seeking to prove themselves professionally (Callahan 2010, 38:17–40:47). Wylie (2022) remarks that she

was impressed by how thoughtful and rigorous *Hypatia* reviewers were. Even when a paper was clearly not going to be publishable ... referees typically started by pointing out what was valuable and then offered detailed advice about how to build on the useful/innovative/important points. This generosity was matched by incisive critical appraisal.

She (2022) continues:

It was a telling irony that when *Hypatia* received ‘A’ ratings as a journal, [Brian] Leiter snarled that obviously it was just a ‘friends and family’ operation ... not fully professional. In fact, refereeing practice was one of the key considerations in these ratings, and *Hypatia* had [already] put in place exactly the professional policies and practices that were [later] being demanded.

Despite disciplinary pushback, the journal has undoubtedly had a demographic impact on the profession by opening a pathway to legitimacy for women scholars. Here it is important to note that historically the norm set by the discipline had encouraged harsh and humiliating treatment of interlocutors, especially those regarded as not being “real” philosophers. McAlister remembers graduate students, following the behavior of faculty members, “vying with one another for who could be more vicious,” while Sandra Harding recalls one young woman graduate student, who faced the typical grilling while giving a presentation to her department: “They were

cutting her off at the knees, just leaving her bleeding” (Callahan 2010, 41:21–41:23). A “culture of feminist reviewing,” Joanne Waugh states, arose “in response to the really hostile, horrible reviews that so many of us had been subjected to ... we bore scars, we were not going to do that to our fellow sister writers” (Callahan 2010, 40:47–41:07).

Hypatia has nurtured feminist thought in a number of key areas. The journal has published pieces which have contributed to the development of feminist political and ethical philosophy. Beyond these, it has helped open the fields of feminist epistemology, feminist philosophies of science, ecofeminism, decolonial feminist philosophy (perhaps most significantly, *Hypatia* was the first publisher of a number of María Lugones’s essays in decolonial feminist thought), lesbian philosophy, and very recently trans feminist philosophy. Wylie (2013, 108) notes that “frequently topics taken up by prescient *Hypatia* authors anticipate by a decade or more lines of inquiry that have since gotten uptake in mainstream philosophy and well beyond.” These include relational conceptions of agency, disability theory, and feminist epistemology where epistemologies of ignorance and epistemic injustice were thematized early-on. In addition, not only philosophers but feminist political theorists, sociologists, anthropologists, psychologists, and other scholars read the journal and have made contributions. This interdisciplinarity has required that *Hypatia* refuse the hermetic insularity of some more dominant philosophical approaches, which tend to use exclusive, specialized languages that only philosophers and those trained in its peculiarities could understand.

Of course, as noted above, *who* was to find a home with the journal has been a site of conflict and controversy over the years. The vision of including a plurality of voices and perspectives in the journal, starting with a plurality of philosophical traditions, has had to be steadily revised and expanded to make the journal more welcoming to feminists who are not part of the now somewhat more mainstream, more established, though still fragile, white feminist power-centers in philosophy. Women-of-color feminisms, feminist decolonial philosophy, feminist disability theory and trans feminist philosophy, have all contended with tenuous and fraught forms of welcome in the journal, as well as with experiences of persistent ignorance,

exclusion, or dismissal. As Mann et al. note, even the word “feminism” is wrought with its own self-contradictory history and is often entangled with “racism, colonial control, reinforcement of modes of material inequality, political exclusion, and social sanction” (Mann et al. 2019, 395). It is therefore not enough to limit one’s inclusive practices to feminists marginalized in philosophy, the journal also has to contend with how feminist philosophy *itself* perpetuates forms of marginalization.

While *Hypatia* has too often been a site of exclusion, the forum of the Special Issue “has sometimes allowed *Hypatia* to create space for scholars who are subjected to the most persistent forms of marginalization in the discipline, and for intersectional feminist work, even as *Hypatia* as a whole has been justly criticized for the underrepresentation of such work” (Mann et al., 397). Some special issues have brought an international dimension to an otherwise Anglo-centered journal (Narayan and Harding 1998, 13.2, 13.3), and others carved out space for the various traditions within feminist philosophy, including women of color feminism (Dotson 2014, 29.1), feminism and disability studies (Kittay, Silvers, and Wendell 2001, 16.4; 2002, 17.3; Hall 2015, 30.1), indigenous women’s scholarship (Talamantez, Guerro, and Waters 2003, 18.2), queer theory (Callahan, Mann, and Ruddick 2007, 22.1), and transgender studies (Bettcher and Garry 2008, 24.3) [Mann et al 2019 397].

After an explosive public controversy in 2017, over an article published by *Hypatia* comparing arguments defending trans experience to those claiming transracial identities, the editor resigned and the Board of Associate Editors was disbanded. A transition team, along with the non-profit board, reconstituted *Hypatia*. They chose a diverse editorial team, non-profit board, and Board of Associate Editors. The journal recommitted itself to the principle that, when turning to the discussion of problems related to those who occupy marginalized social positions of any kind, it is never appropriate to take those subjects as mere objects of study, without regard for knowledge, perspectives, or practices that emerge from those so located. *Hypatia*’s governance structure was rebuilt, with the intention of addressing internal operations, disputes, and ethical dilemmas more constructively when they arise. In addition,

the new editorial team took steps to more robustly engage feminist philosophy outside the Anglo/North American tradition, building an International Advisory Board to help with this effort. One of the most notable projects undertaken is the “Feminism in Translation” initiative, which encourages scholars to submit English translations of noteworthy essays previously published in another language, that have had an impact in their home language.

Part III: Impact

Perhaps *Hypatia*’s biggest impact has been in bringing feminist *philosophical* thought to a wide interdisciplinary audience of feminist scholars. McAlister notes that the hope of *Hypatia* was to *create* feminist philosophy, which would in turn legitimate both feminist scholars and feminist scholarship (Callahan 2010, 5:40). From the beginning, the journal has fostered forms of inquiry that break through barriers and create conditions of possibility for feminist philosophy to grow and change (Gruen and Wylie 2013). By constituting a canon of feminist philosophy scholars could work from, *Hypatia* assisted in the development and legitimation of feminist thought, in the form of seminars, symposiums, dissertations, articles, essays, books, etc. Many scholars whose work would not have been recognized as philosophy or published in journals run by men, have found a publication home in *Hypatia*, and many of these scholars have advanced into the senior ranks of academia, gaining real institutional power and public recognition. Indeed, some of the now most recognized and visionary of feminist philosophers published essays in *Hypatia* early on, including Linda Martín Alcoff, Sandra Lee Bartky, Judith Butler, Claudia Card, Patricia Hill Collins, Evelyn Fox-Keller, Nancy Fraser, Marilyn Frye, Eva Kittay, María Lugones, Joyce Trebilcot, Val Plumwood, and Iris Marion Young (among many more). A number of *Hypatia*’s founders report that they have seen the culture of philosophy more broadly change, and as Ann Garry remarks, “we have ourselves to thank for that” (Callahan 2010).

To be sure, a nuanced self-scrutiny is always required in *Hypatia* and is what gives the journal its critical and political edge. Joanne Waugh writes:

the maturity of one philosophical generation typically brings in its wake revolt by the next, and so the generation of second-wave feminists who struggled to define philosophical feminism and make it ‘philosophically respectable’ has trained another generation of philosophical feminists eager to leave their own mark on feminist philosophy. (Waugh 1995, xii)

And as Jacqueline M. Thomason notes, it was always SWIP’s vision to create a journal that was not simply academic in nature but

something living and breathing, a place to create and develop ideas. A place to try things out and not have them forever cast in stone. A place to be wrong *with impunity* and to learn from it. Where being first and being right were less important than learning something new. Where the process was more important than the product. (Trebilcot 1990, ix; our emphasis).

Hypatia garners its strength not by hiding or obliterating its own complicity in marginalizing and exclusionary practices but by actively refashioning and fighting for a vision of feminist solidarity. As Mann et al. write, “living up to *Hypatia*’s promise requires navigating these complex and contradictory realities, it means listening to the grievances of those the journal has failed to welcome and failed to hear” (Mann et al. 2019, 395).

Conclusion

Today, *Hypatia* enjoys a reputation as the preeminent feminist philosophy journal in the English-speaking world. This is a far cry from where the journal began, as the kitchen-table dream of a handful of feminist philosophers enraged by the hostility of their discipline and determined to create a space for their work. Now the journal is a sought-after publication venue for those who are attempting to build their professional credentials in philosophy, whatever their primary area of expertise. This is a double-edged accomplishment. On the one hand, the hope of the founders was that *Hypatia* would enable feminist scholars to achieve professional legitimacy. It has become an avenue for credential building for young scholars since a publication in *Hypatia* is now regarded as evidence of high-level professional achievement. Feminist philosophy is legitimized as a result. On the other hand, as *Hypatia* is bound to the strictures of academic publishing, it runs the risk of

becoming just the kind of gatekeeper that frustrated the early founders when they tried to publish in mainstream (“malestream”) journals. As Mann et al. write:

the journal’s hard-won standing in the world of academic publishing ... has necessarily come at the cost of its entanglement in the professional practices, managerial and administrative norms, and discursive conventions that are part of the machinery that tends to maintain historical patterns of exclusion and suppression ... It has published groundbreaking work that has literally changed the status of feminist thought in professional philosophy, and at the same time it also finds itself in the position of being experienced by many scholars who find their marginalization in the discipline to be tenacious and unremitting as an institutional site of the reproduction of that exclusion. (Mann et al. 2019, 395)

Given this, the co-editorial team of Mann, McKenna, Russell, and Zambrana called in their first editorial for a commitment to maintaining the openness of “precarious spaces of resistance.” “We understand *Hypatia* to be one of those precarious spaces of resistance,” they wrote, “where intentions and outcomes do not perfectly mirror each other. We see *Hypatia* as aspiring to a critical practice that must be vigilantly maintained even as it remains open to radical transformation, as new historical and material conditions present themselves” (Mann et al. 2019, 398). This requires, they suggest, a pledge to “keep [the journal’s] own fallibility in sight rather than suppress or deny it” (Mann et al. 2019, 399).

When we consider *Hypatia*’s success over nearly four decades, we can see how the dream of having a “journal of our own” has been born out. This dream was a key motivation for *Hypatia*’s founding and continues to be a central driving force behind the journal’s longevity.

BONNIE MANN AND BROOKE BURNS

References

- al-Hibri Y., Azizah. 1990. “*Hypatia*’s Birth: It Took a Village.” *Hypatia* 28, no. 2: 399–403.
- al-Hibri Y., Azizah. 1990. “Preface by Founding Editor in *Hypatia Reborn*, edited by Azizah Y. al-Hibri and Margaret A. Simons, xi–xii. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- al-Hibri Y., Azizah, and Margaret A. Simons. 1990. *Hypatia Reborn*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Bettcher, Talia and Ann Garry. 2008. “Introduction to *Hypatia* Special Issue: ‘Transgender Studies and Feminism: Theory, Politics, and Gendered Realities’.” *Hypatia* 24, no. 3: 1–10.
- Callahan, Joan, Bonnie Mann, and Sara Ruddick. 2007. “Editors Introduction to Writing Against Heterosexism.” *Hypatia* 22, no. 1: vii–xv.
- Callahan, Joan, dir. 2010. *Feminist Philosophers: In Their Own Words (Interview with Hypatia Founders and Editors)*. State College, PA: FemPhil Productions.
- Gruen, Lori, and Alison Wylie. 2013. “Feminist Legacies/Feminist Futures: 25th Anniversary Special Issue – Editors’ Introduction.” *Hypatia* 25, no. 4: 725–32.
- Interview with ‘Hypatia’ Founders and Editors*, dir. Joan Callahan, contributors, Ann Garry, Sandra Harding, Helen Longino, Linda López McAlister, Kathryn Morgan, Laurie J. Shrage, Margaret A. Simons, and Joanne Waugh. 2009. Seattle, Washington.
- Mann, Bonnie, Erin McKenna, Camisha Russell, and Rocío Zambrana. 2019. “The Promise of Feminist Philosophy.” *Hypatia* 34, no. 3: 394–400.
- Serniak, Donna. 1983. “Introduction.” *Hypatia* 1, no. 1: 1–5.
- Scholz J. Sally, and Shelley Wilcox. 2014. “Editor’s Introduction.” *Hypatia* 29, no. 2: 267–8.
- Trebilcot, Joyce. 1990. “Foreword.” In *Hypatia Reborn*, ed. Azizah Y. al-Hibri and Margaret A. Simons. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Walker, Margaret Urban. 2004. “Waiter, There’s a Fly in My Soup! Reflections on the *Philosophical Gourmet Report*.” *Hypatia* 19, no. 3: 235–9.
- Waugh, Joanne. 1995. “Preface.” *Hypatia* 10, no. 4: vii–ix.
- Wylie, Alison. 2013. “On a Collective Undertaking.” *Hypatia* 25, no. 4: 107–11.
- Wylie, Alison. 2022. “Personal Correspondence with Alison Wylie.”

51. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*

For decades, feminist scholars and activists had been contributing through research, conferences, and advocacy to the process of remapping the space of international politics. Yet the near absence of gender and feminist inquiry as research topics in the key journals in the field of international relations (IR) continued apace. The creation and evolution of the *International Feminist Journal of Politics* (IFJP) from its launch with volume 1 in 1999 has been one focus for filling that void.

What's in a title?

The IFJP had its historical roots in an international community of feminist researchers attached to the Feminist Theory and Gender Studies section of the North American dominated International Studies Association and the newly launched Gender and International Relations Working Group (now Gendering International Relations Working Group) of the British International Studies Association. The journal's beginnings in 1997–98 focused on discussions about its structure and its title, the seeds from which it continues to grow. The title finally arrived at captured its conceptual origins, but also the pathways along which it aimed to chart its journey and future potential.

As a collection of words, a title can often be ordered differently so its ultimate form is far from accidental. This was certainly the case with IFJP, and after more than 20 years of the journal's existence, it remains interesting to reflect on the history behind that ordering and what has transpired since the journal's beginning. "International" indicated both the journal's disciplinary roots in IR, and a major commitment to continuously expand its global community, diversity, and epistemic engagements. Positioning "Feminist" after International signaled the journal's theory/practice/activist attachments, while recognizing that different cultures across the world would fashion different forms of feminism, feminist histories, and policy priorities. "Journal" placed IFJP among the venues where scholars and practitioners could publish and publicize their

research, while the modifiers preceding it asserted its character as a journal would reflect international and feminist priorities and their challenges and provocations to the established disciplines.

"Politics" played a number of roles in the title. It reaffirmed the connection of the journal to the disciplinary field of IR, often referred to as International Politics or Politics and International Relations in the names of academic departments and courses. It also signposted the critical processes and practices of active engagement with diverse, contested points of view implied in each of the title's preceding words, International, Feminist, and Journal. In other words, Politics was the journal's disciplinary boundary, and also the theoretical and practical enterprise through which editors and contributors alike established the journal and its editorial policies, interrogated the scope of "the international," and shaped and were shaped by debates about the ever-evolving meanings and actions of "Feminist."

A journal as a set of spaces

An academic journal is always a space or set of spaces as well as a journey through space and time connected to the different groups of people engaged with it as editors, contributors, reviewers, and readers. It is a living entity to the extent that it endures through a range of human efforts channeled into it by individuals and institutions, such as universities, think tanks, and activist organizations, as well as publishing and market processes, websites and social media.

It is commonplace that an academic journal's key role is to feature original, cutting-edge articles of the highest quality. Most journals join a cluster of already established publications in the disciplines whose scholarly conversations they want to contribute to and shape. IFJP was no different. The journal had to find its specific place in that context and build a community of writers, readers, and reviewers. Its editorial board and members' and editors' networks, as well as larger professional associations, were the starting point.

Launch editors from Australia, the USA, the UK, and then India, helped establish a reasonably wide geographic footprint for the journal from its early days. Yet, at the outset, the editors and board recognized that

this was very much a small beginning, which they would need to expand as much and as quickly as possible. A pivotal foundation stone supporting that principle was the strategic decision to limit the editorial team's tenure to a maximum of two terms of three years each, with the possibility of some continuity across teams. The challenges of such a structure were obvious at the start: rapid transition timescales put pressure on teams to be up and running quickly and effectively, while simultaneously developing clear agendas for aims within their time steering the journal operation, a process that ate into a team's tenure time. On the plus side were the opportunities this process afforded for continuous and expanded inclusion of new visions and fresh inputs to the journal content and community, as well as for constantly communicating a sense of openness to the wider world.

Openness to being influenced by the world outside the academy was also in play in the form and organization of the journal's contents. While the main body would include the usual collection of academic articles, along with regular themed special issues, offering the chance for other editorial teams to shape the content, as is the norm, additional elements were added to the journal's shape in order to bring in voices from practice and activism alongside those from academia. A section of the journal entitled "Conversations" was created as a space open to different forms of writing as diverse as interviews, commentaries, poetry, film analysis, and exchanges on specific topics. The section's title was intended to signal not only the embrace of diverse voices but also openness to the variety of forms in which those might be expressed. This space was meant to cross institutional borders and boundaries in order to foster dialogue in multiple forms on as wide as possible a range of topics related to the journal's remit, given the limitations of print and the possibilities enabled by electronic links.

A book review section has been a standard though not universal feature of most journals. Although it was optional, there was a sense that the review section would be valuable not only for academics and students, but also that including this different form of writing could widen the reach of the journal to a larger group of contributors, whether experienced or new to the academic arena. An innovation

in this section was the inclusion of reviews of "classic" texts, as well as newly published works.

In combination, the sections of the journal take forward in more detail the ambitions signaled in its title, and the incremental growth of that seed into leaves, blooms and branches of different shapes and sizes. As important as all the content has been, as we entered the twenty-first century it must be said that the publication of feminist work, notably academic articles essential to the building of careers, remained a prime and underserved need, when the full field of journals is considered.

Although a recent study of five major political science journals found no evidence of gender bias in their internal editorial process, the authors of those studies noted a persistent gender gap in publication rates between women and men in top-tiered journals in the field and, yet, could offer no clear explanation for it (Brown and Samuels 2018, 847–8). Of course, measuring a "gender gap" in published research by comparing rates of publication between men and women remains an inadequate indication of the historically embedded bases for gender bias in the field impacting on the content in mainstream journals. Regardless of the gender identity of an author, gender bias continues to be operational in less readily observed or measurable ways if journal editors judge a research subject or mode of presentation to be outside the scope of the field or inappropriate to the journal's remit. Definitions of, or perspectives on, this "scope" are determined within wider academic (and societal) structures identifying and influencing judgments of what constitutes "appropriate" research content or mode of presentation, affecting in critical ways what editors consider to be core or marginal to the field.

To establish the journal as an influential outlet for feminist research, the early editorial teams worked diligently over a period of years to secure IFJP's place in the citation indexes. This was a particularly challenging endeavor since the standards for inclusion require a journal to meet specific criteria, including rates of rejection, to demonstrate its quality and impact in the field. Mindful of its role to provide a critical outlet for feminist work of the highest quality, the editorial processes at IFJP were designed to offer maximum support to guide an article through revision to

publication. At the outset of the journal, the editorial team assigned an incoming article to one of the three editors, who took the lead, locating appropriate reviewers, supervising the review process, summarizing key points from the reviews for an author, and in the cases of recommendations of “revise and resubmit”, guiding the author toward publication. These processes have evolved and expanded over the years and feature varied forms of feedback to contributors at different stages from submission through final editing.

The editorial practice combined traditional academic standards, such as anonymous peer reviewing of articles, with transparency through sharing comments among reviewers, while providing detailed guidance to authors about ways to respond to reviewers’ reports, that is, how to negotiate competing and sometimes conflicting demands reviewers made for revision. A prime element of the success of the journal is its continued provision of a vital publication route for feminist writing and academics that is multi-modal, multi-voiced, multi-dimensional, interdisciplinary, and intersectional. In doing so now as an established journal included in the citation indexes, IFJP adds substantially to the archive of feminist work accessible to new and aspiring scholars, students, and practitioners. The longevity of the journal to date is part of its community building as much as its academic contributions in conventional terms.

Understanding IFJP’s reach cannot be limited either to an assessment of the impact factor or citation history of its published articles or its longevity. Equally important is the community of feminist scholars and activists nourished by IFJP through the many international conferences that the journal has co-sponsored or participated in since 2012. These have helped to widen IFJP’s geographical footprint as well as the range of its links to, and presence for, growing and more

diverse networks of feminist researchers and activists. The intellectual, political, and social exchanges at these events all contribute to extending the journal’s interactive culture of engagement. Organizational teams and processes for the conferences are also part of the journal’s expansive leadership work and learning towards fresh inputs and future innovations.

Feminist time and space

As the journal moves past its second decade of existence, it will continue to engage with the highly contested politics around identity and representation, issues that are constantly debated in academia as well as throughout contemporary culture. Whose voices can be heard in the process of shaping political agendas? What issues matter in politics and to whom? How can discussions about the who, what, and where of politics continue to be broadened, and how might the journal contribute to these? What role can the journal play in effecting change?

As IFJP continues to evolve, these and a host of other questions will be the focus of its contributions to the diversity of feminist engagement within the shifting contours of international politics, through the publication of academic and applied research, and the creation of collaborative opportunities to share research and practice in multiple ways.

KATHLEEN B. JONES AND GILLIAN YOUNGS

References

- Brown, Nadia E., and David Samuels. 2018. “Introduction to Gender in the Journals, Continued: Evidence from Five Political Science Journals.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 51, no. 4: 847–48.

See also

Feminist Critiques of Political Science; Feminism and the State

52. *Monthly Review*

Monthly Review (MR) was founded in New York City in 1949, in the midst of the post-World War II repression of the U.S. Left. The journal announced itself right from the start, and on the cover of every subsequent issue, as “An Independent Socialist Magazine.” Its first issue (May 1949) featured an article by Albert Einstein entitled “Why Socialism?” Its founding editors were the socialist educator/journalist Leo Huberman and the Marxist economist Paul M. Sweezy. Their collaboration signaled MR’s commitment to blending popular reportage and commentary with clearly articulated theoretical insight. Politically, MR sought to offer a radical critique of capitalism, while not tying itself to the position of any particular Left organization. In terms of the controversies of that period, this meant being neither pro-communist nor anticommunist, but instead expressing, in a style free of sloganeering, the continuing vitality of Marxist thought – an approach “perfectly suited to a bruised American left seeking new modes of expression and new forms of community, with a recent history of disappointment and organizational failure” (Phelps 1999, 4).

Einstein’s support for MR epitomized the intellectual richness of the political community from which it emerged at the time. Huberman (1903–68) had written an “alternative” history of the United States (*We the People*) and a widely diffused introduction to economic history (*Man’s Worldly Goods*) as well as an investigative exposé, *The Labor Spy Racket*. In one of his pedagogical pamphlets (*How to Spread the Word*), he argued for a low-key approach to political persuasion, based on laying out the facts and letting them speak for themselves. Sweezy (1910–2004), for his part, had been an economics professor at Harvard University, having received a PhD from that university in 1937, at a time when he was participating in a New Deal project investigating the concentration of economic power in the United States. His 1942 book, *The Theory of Capitalist Development*, presented an up-to-date and authoritative introduction to the methodology of Marx’s *Capital* (Foster 2021).

Two other major figures in the original MR group were the economists Paul A. Baran (1909–64) and Harry Magdoff (1913–2006).

Baran, who had been educated in the Soviet Union and Germany (where he was associated with the Frankfurt School), had a varied career leading to his 1951 appointment to the faculty of Stanford University, where he became the only tenured Marxist economist at that time in the United States. His 1957 book, *The Political Economy of Growth*, pioneered the argument for socialist revolution as the only possible path to emergence from underdevelopment. He would later co-author with Sweezy the influential 1966 work, *Monopoly Capital*, which applied Marxist analysis to the dynamics of the modern corporation (on the Baran/Sweezy collaboration, see Foster 2017). Magdoff worked as an economist in various U.S. government agencies and later in the private sector before turning to political writing, which led to his widely translated 1969 book (originally a series of MR articles), *The Age of Imperialism*, where he explained the vital role of foreign operations in sustaining U.S. capitalism. After Huberman’s death, he joined Sweezy as co-editor of MR, co-authoring with him several books based on their jointly written “Reviews of the Month” (ROMs, lead-articles in each issue of MR) (on Magdoff, see Foster 2006).

A major project of MR, on a par with the magazine, has been its book-publishing arm, MR Press. This was launched in 1952, occasioned by journalist I.F. Stone’s search for a publisher for his *Hidden History of the Korean War*. The Press would go on to become an important outlet for Marxist theoretical works (both classic and current), covering the full range of the social sciences, including especially the work of MR’s editors (often adapted from their ROMs), as well as radical testimony such as William Hinton’s unique eye-witness account of the Chinese Revolution (*Fanshen: Documentary of Revolution in a Chinese Village*), published in 1966 after many years fighting U.S. Customs for release of the field notes on which it was based. Many MR Press books grew out of the magazine’s regular summer double issues. A notable scoop in this category was Huberman and Sweezy’s report on their 1960 visit (along with Baran) to Cuba (*Cuba: Anatomy of a Revolution*), which was the first book to interpret the Cuban Revolution as socialist. The Press greatly expanded its offerings under the leadership of Harry Braverman (1920–76), a long-time labor activist and author of the now-classic work *Labor and*

Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century (1974).

The Cuban experience heralded a rising revolutionary wave throughout Latin America. MR followed this process journalistically and engaged it theoretically. Its coverage ranged from debates over guerrilla warfare to critical analysis of Chile's attempt (between 1970 and 1973) at a "peaceful road to socialism." Above all, MR and its Press brought the concept of imperialism to the forefront in accounting for the obstacles to development faced by countries of the Global South. Central to this endeavor was the work of Andre Gunder Frank, beginning with his 1966 article "The Development of Underdevelopment," which popularized the observation that underdevelopment is not a pre-capitalist condition but is rather the underside of capitalist development.

MR's scope is multi-issue and internationalist. The magazine evolved in a dynamic relationship to the progression of radical activism. Its mid-1970s peak circulation of around 13,000 reflected its influential voice in the context of global liberation struggles and of strategic debates sparked by China's Cultural Revolution and the Sino-Soviet split. That period also saw a number of short-lived efforts at producing editions of MR in other countries, including India and (in translation) Argentina, Germany, Greece, Italy, and Spain. Circulation declined gradually after the end of the New Left surge in the U.S., but has held steady since 2010 in the 4,000-5,000 range (on MR circulation, see McChesney 2007, section V). Significantly, however, the reach of MR's perspective has been greatly amplified in recent years by its online presence (first, beginning in 2005, as MRzine, and subsequently, since 2017, as MRonline.org). The magazine's articles (monthlyreview.org) draw roughly 100,000 users per month, of whom a majority are under age 35. MRonline, with its daily postings from numerous sources, drawing around 150,000 monthly hits, has in effect taken up the journalistic dimension of the magazine's content in its earlier years, while the magazine's articles in recent years have tended to become longer and more theoretical, often with copious endnotes. MR has maintained, however, its commitment to clear writing, eschewing esoteric jargon.

Long-time editors Sweezy and Magdoff began in the 1990s, with the help of an

editorial advisory committee, to seek other co-editors. The first to join them was historian and political theorist Ellen Meiksins Wood (a professor at York University in Toronto), whose writings included *The Retreat from Class* (1986), a Marxist critique of postmodernist eclecticism. She served as co-editor from 1997 to 2000. At that point, the two senior editors were joined by John Bellamy Foster, a professor at the University of Oregon who had written on Sweezy's work and on the environmental crisis, and by Robert W. McChesney, a University of Illinois professor and author of books on mass communications. McChesney stepped down in 2004. With Sweezy's death that year, and Magdoff's in 2006, Foster, who was born in 1953, remained as editor-in-chief. The current associate editor is Brett Clark, a sociologist who has co-authored a number of works with Foster; and the director of MR press is Michael D. Yates, author of several books on working-class and labor issues.

MR is an internationally recognized platform for Marxist thought. Between the magazine, the press, and the website, it addresses a wide range of vital topics. Central is its treatment of political economy, as in the above-mentioned writings of Sweezy, Baran, Magdoff, and Braverman, as well as later co-written works by Sweezy and Magdoff and, more recently, by Foster and Fred (son of Harry) Magdoff, analysing the stagnation and financialization of neoliberal capitalism. On the links between capitalism and racism, MR has published writings of (among others) W.E.B. Du Bois, Oliver Cromwell Cox, Gerald Horne, Robin D.G. Kelley, Manning Marable, and Cornel West, and in 2020 MR devoted its summer issue to the topic of *Racial Capitalism*. On women's struggles, Margaret Benston's landmark September 1969 MR article "The Political Economy of Women's Liberation" was commemorated in a special September 2019 issue with articles on the development of social reproduction theory by such leading figures as Silvia Federici, Martha Gimenez, Selma James, Leith Mullings, and Marge Piercy. Other topics covered in special summer issues include *Religion and the Left* (1984), *Science, Technology and Capitalism* (1986), *Marxism and the Postmodern Agenda* (1995), *Marxism and the Information Age* (1996), *Agriculture, Food, and Ecology* (1998), *Prisons and Executions: The U.S. Model* (2001), *Ecology: Moment of Truth*

(2008), *Education Under Fire* (2011), *The Cultural Apparatus of Monopoly Capital* (2013), *Surveillance Capitalism* (2014), and *The New Cold War on China* (2021).

The preeminent focus of MR since 2000, however, has been the environmental crisis. Foster's *Marx's Ecology* (2000) played a key role in establishing a new paradigm for ecological critique, in which sensitivity to environmental issues was understood no longer as something that had to be grafted onto Marxism, but rather – in light of the “metabolic rift” Marx saw capital as having inflicted on the natural world – as a dimension that is integral to the whole analysis of capital. With this understanding, the ultimate transcendence of capitalist rule could be seen as essential to preserving the ecosphere. Foster elaborated on this theme in his 2009 book *The Ecological Revolution* and further popularized it with his 2011 work (co-authored with Fred Magdoff), *What Every Environmentalist Needs to Know About Capitalism*. Fred Magdoff, together with socialist activist Chris Williams, would give a thorough perspective on the socialist alternative in their 2017 book, *Creating an Ecological Society: Toward a Revolutionary Transformation*. Finally, the depth of Marx's own ecological preoccupation, as expressed in unpublished notes of his last years, would be evoked by Kohei Saito in his book (like all the ones listed here, published by MR Press) *Karl Marx's Ecosocialism* (2017).

VICTOR WALLIS

References

- Baran, Paul A. 1957. *The Political Economy of Growth*. New York: Review Press.
- Baran, Paul A. and Paul M. Sweezy. 1966. *Monopoly Capital: An Essay on the American Economic and Social Order*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Foster, John Bellamy. 2000. *Marx's Ecology: Materialism and Nature*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Foster, John Bellamy. 2006. “The Optimism of the Heart (Memorial to Harry Magdoff).” *Monthly Review* 58, no. 5 (October): 10–26.
- Foster, John Bellamy. 2021. “Paul Marlor Sweezy, 1910–2004.” In *Routledge Handbook of Marxism and Post-Marxism*, eds. Alex Callinicos, Stathis Kouvelakis, and Lucia Pradella, 503–10. London: Routledge.
- Foster, John Bellamy, ed. 2017. *The Age of Monopoly Capital: The Selected Correspondence of Paul A. Baran and Paul M. Sweezy, 1949–1964*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Huberman, Leo, and Paul M. Sweezy. 1960. *Cuba: Anatomy of a Revolution*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Magdoff, Harry. 1969. *The Age of Imperialism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- McChesney, Robert W. 2007. “The Monthly Review Story: 1949–1984.” MRonline, <https://mronline.org/2007/05/06/the-monthly-review-story-1949-1984/>.
- McChesney, Robert W., Ellen Meiksins Wood, and John Bellamy Foster, eds. 1998. *Capitalism and the Information Age*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Phelps, Christopher. 1999. “A Socialist Magazine in the American Century.” *Monthly Review* 51, no. 1 (May): 1–30.
- Sweezy, Paul M. 1942. *The Theory of Capitalist Development*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wood, Ellen Meiksins. 1986. *The Retreat from Class: A New “True” Socialism*. Verso Books.
- Wood, Ellen Meiksins and John Bellamy Foster, eds. 1997. *In Defense of History: Marxism and the Postmodern Agenda*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

53. *New Political Science: a journal of politics & culture*

Following its founding in 1967, the Caucus for a *New Political Science* (CNPS) led an organizational revolt within the American Political Science Association (APSA). This revolt challenged the failure to address salient political issues and social movements in the APSA annual conference program, the lack of attention to pedagogy in political science, and the emerging behavioral orthodoxy of the *American Political Science Review* (APSR) (Sigelman 2006). During the late 1960s and 1970s, there were similar uprisings in economics, sociology, history, philosophy, anthropology, education, and geography and, in every instance, these organizational insurgencies established new ideological sub-divisions within the established professional associations (e.g., Marxist sections), or they resulted in counter-associations that directly challenged the hegemony of official intellectual paradigms. These challenges often took the form of new professional associations, journals, and conferences, which opened those disciplines to more radical and critical approaches – both methodologically and ideologically – such as Marxism, feminism, post-structuralism, post-modernism, and post-colonialism (Schrecker 2019).

The journal *New Political Science* thus emerged as part of a wider intellectual ferment in the social sciences and humanities and, as with other disciplinary insurgencies, the journal was viewed by its founders as the cornerstone of an emerging counter-association that would directly challenge the American Political Science Association and its flagship journal, the *American Political Science Review* (Barrow 2017, 2022). The CNPS lagged behind its counterparts in this war of maneuver (Gramsci 1971, 229–49), partly because it did not make the decision to become a “counter-association” as opposed to a “caucus” until 1978, but also because its first foray into journal publication went awry (Barrow 2017, 464–5). The Caucus initially subsidized a small group of Caucus activists, led by Ira Katznelson to establish the journal *Politics & Society*, which published its first issue in November of 1970 (Seidelman 1985, 198). While *Politics &*

Society quickly emerged as a leading outlet for political analyses informed by Marxist theory, in the spring of 1973 (Vol. 3, No. 3) the editorial board was reconstituted in ways that signaled its drift away from new political science towards “the new institutionalism” and “historical sociology.” By the end of the 1970s, *Politics & Society* no longer had any direct relationship to the CNPS or its members.

In 1977–78, Victor Wallis (1979), the incoming CNPS Chairman concluded that the Caucus was “at a turning point” after Bertell Ollman’s overwhelming electoral defeat in the 1978 APSA Presidential election. Wallis concluded that the future of the CNPS lay outside the APSA in a counter-association that could recruit a cadre of young radicals who were entirely disaffected with the APSA and the political science discipline generally. The establishment of a journal was considered critical to making the CNPS “a viable counter-institution to the American Political Science Association” (Wallis 1979, 89). For several years, the Caucus had already been self-publishing a broadsheet called *New Political Science* (NPS) which included news about the Caucus and profession, as well as short analytical pieces on the state of the discipline. *New Political Science* was elevated to the status of an official flagship journal in 1979.

The new journal’s editors declared that the founding of *New Political Science* marked a new phase in the CNPS’s organizational development, which would now be focused on facilitating an intellectual revolution within the discipline that would by-pass the institutionalized hegemony of the APSA and its flagship journal. As a major part of this transition:

The Caucus is committed to developing an understanding and critique of capitalist society, to helping create the social changes needed to transcend it, and to replacing feelings of isolation with a sense of community and collective action. Now it is focusing its energies on building the strong organization needed to advance an alternative politics and to create a socialist center of gravity within the profession. (“The Socialist Academic” 1979, 3)

NPS was originally organized as an Editorial Collective, so the journal was initially owned, published, and managed by a six-person

Editorial Collective, which consisted mostly of political science graduate students attending Columbia University or junior faculty who had recently graduated from Columbia University. While the journal received input from the CNPS through a Caucus appointed Editorial Board, the journal was otherwise an independent self-perpetuating and self-published journal from 1979 to 1991. The journal encountered numerous problems during its first 13 years, but *New Political Science* did manage to publish 15 issues of the journal.

During this time (1979–91), NPS published 105 articles authored or co-authored by 101 different scholars. In addition to a cluster of Caucus activists that included Timothy W. Luke, Mark Kesselman, Stanley Aronowitz, Theodore Norton, and Victor Wallis, NPS was an outlet for a long list of prominent Marxist, feminist, and left-wing scholars, including Isaac D. Balbus, Etienne Balibar, Jean Baudrillard, Carl Boggs, Fred Block, Robert W. Cox, Jacques Derrida, Andrea Dworkin, Barbara Epstein, Kathy E. Ferguson, Jürgen Habermas, Nancy Hartsock, Dick Howard, Frederic Jameson, Douglas Kellner, Manning Marable, Herbert Marcuse, Michael Parenti, Paul Piccone, and James Petras. This is not a list of authors that would ever appear in the *American Political Science Review* or any of the regional association journals.

An equally dramatic difference between NPS and the APSR is evident in a comparison of keywords that appear in the titles of articles published in the two journals from 1979 to 1991. The five top clusters of keywords in NPS during this time (in order of frequency) were: (1) Academic Freedom/Higher Education/Intellectuals/University, (2) Socialism/Socialists, (3) Democracy/Democratic, (4) Feminism/Patriarchy/Women, and (5) Marx/Marxism.

Another factor distinguishing NPS from the official political science journals has been its openness to interdisciplinary research on politics conducted by scholars and practitioners not affiliated with political science departments. For instance, from 1979 to 1991, more than 60 percent of the contributors to *New Political Science* were not affiliated with a political science department. Yet, another distinguishing feature of critical political science is that it does separate “politics” from class, race, ethnicity, and gender (sociology) or from capitalist development

(economics, history). Thus, sociologists were significant contributors to the early journal (15.8 percent) as were scholars affiliated with English, language, and comparative literature departments (11.9 percent) (in part because of a special issue on literature and politics). However, non-academic practitioners affiliated with non-profit and government organizations were also significant contributors to the journal (14.9 percent), which conveys the journal’s genuine commitment to a concept of praxis and “to making political science relevant to the struggle for a better world.” The list is rounded out by scholars affiliated with philosophy, history, economics, women’s studies, urban planning, anthropology, public health, and even zoology.

Finally, the journal has always published a combination of unsolicited peer reviewed manuscripts and invited submissions. From 1979 to 1991, 11 of the 15 issues published were themed issues that covered theoretical topics, such as Critical Theory and Bureaucracy, Marxism and Theory, and Literature and Politics, as well as contemporary political topics, such as Socialism in France, Racism in Europe, The Central American Maelstrom, Francois Mitterand’s 1981 Socialist Party victory in France, and the devastating impact of U.S. President Ronald Reagan’s support for right-wing authoritarian regimes in Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Honduras. One themed issue was devoted to Ecology and Politics, while another was devoted to Sexuality and Capitalism. In this regard, NPS has always sought to cover the full spectrum of class, race, gender, and ecology, as well as contemporary political issues.

However, in the face of financial and organizational difficulties, the CNPS was compelled to address the journal’s struggles in 1989 after Meredith Reid Sarkees (Niagara University) was elected Chair of the CNPS (1988–90). Following the recommendations of a review committee, the journal was reorganized in 1991 to make it directly accountable to the CNPS with the Caucus assuming ownership of the journal from the Editorial Collective. In 1991, when *New Political Science* was recognized as an Organized Section of the APSA, NPS was added to the collection of academic journals published by Carfax, which in 2005 was consolidated into the Taylor & Francis Publishing Group,

where the journal has been published up to the present day.

Over time, the journal's issue focus has responded to contemporary political developments. Thus, during the last decade, the most common topics discussed in the journal include climate politics, LGBTQ politics, feminism, democratic socialism, and anti-Black violence, but it continues to be a forum for a broad array of left perspectives and independent non-sectarian socialist (and occasionally anarchist) perspectives. The journal has continuously maintained an interdisciplinary understanding of political science, and it continues to adopt the broadest possible definition of what counts as "political."

The journal's mission was reaffirmed in 2021 with a message that reminded readers that the journal's mission "has always been to engage conventional political science with critical scholarship, as well as to promote the advancement of rigorous interdisciplinary research that is grounded in political science and conducted from a left perspective." The editors state that the journal will continue to be "widely inclusive of new scholarship coming from a variety of theoretical, interdisciplinary, and issue-based perspectives" (Grant and Snyder-Hall 2021, 1), while observing that:

New Political Science occupies a unique position among scholarly and progressive journals within and outside the discipline. Methodologically agnostic and eclectic, it supports research that questions the logics of capitalism, patriarchy, misogyny, heteronormativity, white supremacy, and other structures of domination as they function in the global capitalist system ... The guiding spirit of this journal has been a political commitment to being an academically rigorous peer-reviewed voice for the full spectrum of the Left. (Grant and Snyder-Hall, 2021, 1)

Importantly, Jocelyn Boryczka (2017), one of the journal's former co-editors, emphasizes that because CNPS is an activist-scholar organization, *New Political Science* should also be understood as one tactic of progressive and radical resistance to the various impulses of authoritarianism that now characterize the age of authoritarian neoliberalism. Boryczka emphasizes that NPS is intended to have a political impact – and not just scholarly

influence – by reaching different audiences than those normally targeted by mainstream academic journals. One could argue that *New Political Science* has reached an ever-wider audience as measured by the continuous upward trend in circulation, from 550 subscriptions and over-the-counter sales in 1980 to more than 2,500 libraries subscriptions to the journal worldwide in 2019. Following its availability in a digitized format, article downloads have consistently increased by double-digit percentages on a year-to-year basis for the last decade, while its digital platform has made the journal's contents more widely available on a global scale.

In addition to circulation, various citation metrics indicate the steadily increasing impact of the journal. Three metrics – CiteScore, SCImago Journal Rank, and Source Normalized Impact per Person – rank NPS higher on two of three metrics than *Political Science Quarterly*, the flagship journal of the Academy of Political Science, and considerably better (by between .3 to .5) than *Perspectives on Political Science*, an official publication of the APSA. While NPS has not attained its original goal of displacing the *American Political Science Review*, or the other regional association journals from their hegemonic positions within the discipline, it has come to occupy a distinct niche among academic journals in the social sciences.

Similarly, in an era of globalization, the journal has made a concerted effort to increase its international presence by including more international authors, particularly those from the Global South, in the journal. More than one-third of global article downloads still occur in North America (36 percent), but Northern and Central Europe now account for nearly one-third (32 percent) of all article downloads, while the Asia-Pacific region accounts for 10 percent of the journal's article downloads.

A second tactic has been to publish special symposia on books or topics of contemporary political relevance, which is another feature that distinguishes it from most mainstream scholarly journals. These symposia have included special sections devoted to the "Transformative Practices of Teacher-Scholar-Activists in the Era of Trump," "Xenophobia, Belonging, and Agency: Citizenship in Immigrant America," "Feminism in Coalition: Rethinking Strategies for Progressive Politics Across

Difference,” and “The Question of Tactics in an Age of Authoritarian Neoliberalism.” The digitization of the journal has made it possible to address contemporary political issues much more quickly than was possible in the past.

Finally, another measure of the journal’s political impact is that its authors are sometimes targeted by various right-wing groups, such as Campus Reform and media outlets such as FoxNews. This targeting of authors has extended to life-threatening emails that identify where authors live for the purpose of threatening an author and their family. While an author’s home institution, and organizations such as the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) or faculty unions are responsible for protecting academic freedom, the Conference for a Critical Political Science, which sponsors the journal, has nevertheless organized a Witness and Advocates program partly for the purpose of assisting members and authors who are under threat due to exercising their right to academic freedom and freedom of speech (McCarthy and Kamola 2022). It is well understood that the purpose of such threats is to quash progressive voices in academia and to create a toxic publication environment, where it becomes increasingly difficult to find authors willing to write from a progressive or left perspective (Barrow 2014). Nevertheless, *New Political Science* remains an important outlet for progressive and socialist scholarship in political science for scholars in the United States and worldwide.

CLYDE W. BARROW AND JOCELYN M.
BORYZCKA

References

- Barrow, Clyde W. 2014. “The Coming of the Corporate-Fascist University? A Review Essay.” *New Political Science* 36, no. 4 (December): 640–46.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 2017. “The Political and Intellectual Origins of New Political Science.” *New Political Science* 39, no. 4 (December): 437–72.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 2022. “What’s in a Name? From New Political Science to Critical Political Science.” *New Political Science* 44, no. 1 (March): 3–26.
- Boryzcka, Jocelyn. 2019. “The State of New Political Science: A Journal of Politics and Culture and Its Future.” Paper Delivered at the 2nd Biennial Conference of the Caucus for a New Political Science, Held at South Padre Island, Texas, February 24–26.
- “Editorial Introduction.” 1970. *Politics & Society* 1, no. 1 (November): 1.
- Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, edited and translated by Quention Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. New York: International Publishers.
- Grant, Judith and Claire Snyder-Hall. 2021. “A Message from the New Editors.” *New Political Science* 43, no. 1 (March): 1–3.
- McCarthy, Samantha & Isaac Kamola. 2022. “Sensationalized Surveillance: Campus Reform and the Targeted Harassment of Faculty.” *New Political Science* 44, no. 2 (June): 227–47.
- “Note to Readers.” 1979. *New Political Science* 1, no. 1 (Spring): 7.
- Schrecker, Ellen. 2019. “The Disciplines and the Left: The Radical Caucus Movement.” *The Radical Teacher* 114 (Summer): 8–11.
- Seidelman, Raymond. 1985. *Disenchanted Realists: Political Science and the American Crisis, 1884–1984*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Sigelman, Lee. 2006. “The Coevolution of American Political Science and the American Political Science Review.” *American Political Science Review* 100, no. 4 (November): 463–78.
- “The Socialist Academic: Between Theory and Practice.” 1979. *New Political Science* 1, nos. 2–3: 3–5.
- Wallis, Victor. 1979. “The Caucus at a Turning Point.” *New Political Science* 1, no. 1 (Spring): 89–92.

See also

Academic Repression; Intellectuals

54. *Review of Radical Political Economics*

The New Left flourished in the United States during the 1960s as manifest in Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), the University of California, Berkeley Free Speech Movement (see Kim 2018), a nationwide campaign for African-American civil rights, the anti-Vietnam War movement, and the poor peoples' movement. The grievances articulated by these movements challenged the sanguine assumptions of the institutionalized social science disciplines in the United States and elsewhere. In particular, mainstream economics' *ex post* rationalizations of the status quo, its emphasis on individual preferences, its belief in the equilibrating tendencies of market forces (perhaps gently assisted by government intervention correcting for the occasional market failure) appeared increasingly inadequate when confronted with a new reality of mass movements and disequilibrium. In parallel with their counterparts in political science and sociology, faculty and students in economics established a professional organization to support radical and critical perspectives in economics, which affirmed the discipline's inherently political nature in contrast to mainstream affectations of "value freedom." The Union for Radical Political Economics (URPE) was founded in 1968 and it continues to support the development of theoretically grounded, rigorously applied, and socially engaged radical inquiry in economics that advances the critique of actually existing capitalism, expose its contradictions, dysfunctions and injustices, and to assist social movements that challenge it. In addition, URPE has encouraged the study of non-capitalist alternatives.

In 1969, URPE established its peer-reviewed academic journal, *Review of Radical Political Economics* (RRPE), which has been published quarterly in most years since 1970. It quickly became a leading outlet for critical scholarship in its field, encompassing a wide spectrum of theoretical perspectives, consistent with the URPE founders' decision to eschew formal alignment with a single theoretical tradition or political line, and with their refusal even to define exactly what is radical political economics. Instead, RRPE has hosted works

ranging from reformist Post-Keynesian and institutionalist economics to revolutionary Marxist and ecofeminist perspectives, and much in between. In addition, from its U.S.-specific origins, the journal has since expanded its global reach to reflect URPE's increasingly international membership and the journal's worldwide readership.

Given the hegemonic position of neoclassical economics and its practitioners within the discipline, much of heterodox economics is practiced by scholars in university departments other than economics. C. Wright Mills' depiction of mainstream social science as characterized by grand theory and abstracted empiricism remains applicable to the conventional economics discipline, which has its own "methodological inhibition" (fetishizing mathematics) and pretensions to "value freedom" (Mills 1959). Heterodox economics, by contrast, and almost by default, rejects such practices on methodological grounds. The division between positive and normative is far more blurred and ambiguous in practice, given the purposive nature of social inquiry and its consequent value ladenness. Radical political economics augments that methodological stance with an explicit normative commitment to social justice that is based on the understanding of capitalism as a socially constructed system of power relations whose intrinsic asymmetry generates increasingly disparate outcomes in a process of cumulative causation, absent either reformist legal and policy interventions or the complete revolutionary replacement of the economic system. For this reason, the subject matter of radical political economics is often interdisciplinary, transcending the artificial boundaries of the formal academic disciplines. While this has enhanced its reach and relevance, it has also weakened its status within the official economics discipline, and that of its practitioners, whose presence within economics departments has been in decline for decades. More recently, the global expansion of higher education has led to the proliferation of academic journals, including those serving various strands of heterodox political economy. Nevertheless, the RRPE has retained its prominence as measured by the various journal ranking systems.

The interdisciplinary nature of RRPE's remit is reflected in some of its most cited and influential papers. An early example of this work is Stephen Marglin's analysis of the

hierarchical organization of work in capitalism (Marglin 1974). Rejecting Adam Smith's justification for specialization as facilitating skills enhancement, time saving, and innovation, Marglin instead showed how the disaggregation of tasks enabled the insertion of the capitalist. This exposed the contradiction inherent in the Soviet Union's prioritization of capital accumulation in order to achieve and even surpass the level of development achieved under capitalism. Democratization of the Soviet workplace remained at best a forlorn hope.

Feminist critique of not only capitalism but of Marxism and radical political economics has also featured strongly in the journal, including seven themed issues on radical feminist political economics by 2001 (Mutari 2001). Representative papers include a class analysis of women's oppression under capitalism (Quick 1977), and the critique of patriarchy-based theoretical assumptions and political practices within Marxism (Hartmann and Markusen 1980). URPE's original neglect of women's oppression was quickly corrected following the early influx of participating women economists and a more general acknowledgement of social movements present within its membership. Today, RRPE publishes work that more accurately reflects the diversity of ideological currents in radical political economics (Matthaei 2018).

RRPE's engagement with the political economy of racism has been explicit from the outset, with its inaugural issue featuring a critique of "black capitalism" as a sustainable form of development capable of overcoming deeply entrenched structural racism (Bluestone 1969). However, while papers on imperialism and capitalism's detrimental environmental impact have been published throughout the journal's history, the relation of these to the actual struggles of the Global South has been somewhat neglected (Barkin 2018). This is partly attributable to the proliferation of academic journals in recent decades, and especially those that have a more narrowly focused subject specialization on international, comparative, and global political economy, as well as international and global studies, more broadly. The development and application of social structures of accumulation (SSA) theory has featured regularly in the journal's pages since its emergence in the late 1970s. The onset of

a persistent economic downturn at the start of that decade, and the concurrent rise of the New Right with its upwardly redistributive economic policies, signaled a permanent structural shift in the U.S. political economy that accompanied the end of the post-1945 economic boom.

SSA theory began by revisiting the theory of long waves of capitalist development, avoiding the mechanistic teleology of models associated with some earlier treatments (Kotz 1987). Instead, greater attention was focused on the institutional ensemble that cohered to provide an environment conducive to sustained economic growth in the U.S. after the Second World War: (1) the global military hegemony of "Pax Americana" and its economic counterpart in the Bretton-Woods financial institutions and dollar-gold standard; (2) somewhat controversially (McIntyre and Hillard 2013; Domhoff 2013), what its authors described as a "limited capital-labor accord" between manufacturing employers and trade unions; (3) sustained economic growth and an expanding economic role for the Federal government that served to provide greater welfare support; and (4) the containment of inter-capitalist rivalry, or the managed capitalism typical of Keynesian macroeconomic policy (Bowles, Gordon, and Weisskopf 1990).

By 1970, all of these pillars of the post-1945 SSA were disintegrating. U.S. military might was thwarted in Vietnam, while its economic strength was no longer sufficient to support the dollar-gold standard, which was formally ended in 1971. Increasing labor militancy met with a combination of capitalists' political mobilization and outright employer hostility, alongside an accelerating process of automation, and what later was recognized as offshoring (replacing domestic labor with machines and foreign workforces). As economic growth sputtered, the New Right's ideological assault on the welfare state and Federal government's downwardly redistributive economic policy and market regulation gained traction. Thus, the Carter administration laid the foundations for much of the so-called "Reagan revolution" that followed it, not least in its implementation of monetarist policies, market deregulation, and financial liberalization.

With growing awareness of the limited, U.S.-specific evidential basis for the tenets underpinning a theory with potentially more

international application (Jeong 1997), work within the SSA research program started to incorporate elements of Antonio Gramsci's treatment of the political and ideological dimensions of capitalism with respect to civil society and the balance between coercion and consent (Kotz, McDonough, and Reich 1994). While SSAs were usually situated within states, there was also increasing awareness of the globalization of capitalism and the evolving relations of territorially delimited regimes of accumulation between states and with the wider world system of capitalism-in-aggregate. The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, and China's turbo-charged industrialization and integration into the world capitalist system was vigorously promoted by the Clinton administration. These developments were accompanied by the restructuring of manufacturing industry into global production networks or value (extraction) chains. These changes in the world capitalist economy underlined the need for a thoroughgoing recalibration of SSA theory (see McDonough, Reich, and Kotz 2010).

Nevertheless, even amid the "end of history" triumphalism preceding the 2008 financial crisis, the economic evidence was less compelling. The neoliberal era ushered in by the New Right in the 1970s had failed to produce levels of economic growth comparable to the preceding era of the post-1945 SSA. Its accumulation of debt, however, led to the North Atlantic Financial Crisis, the Great Recession, and persistent stagnation, given the extraordinary and ongoing interventions of central banks and governments aimed at keeping the system afloat. Thus, a revitalized SSA theory must account for the longevity of neoliberalism despite its conspicuous lack of economic growth. As acknowledged by Wolfson and Kotz (2010), it is the stability provided by a coherent institutional ensemble that facilitates capital accumulation, whether or not accumulation is rapid or sluggish. The latter outcome, however, heralds a worldwide resurgence of reactionary and repressive politics (Kotz 2017).

MICHAEL KEANEY

References

Barkin, David. 2018. "Participating in URPE from the Global South." *Review of Radical Political Economics* 50, no. 3: 591–3.

- Bluestone, Barry. 1969. "Black Capitalism: The Path to Black Liberation?" *Review of Radical Political Economics* 1, no. 1: 36–55.
- Bowles, Samuel, David M. Gordon, and Thomas E. Weisskopf. 1990. *After the Waste Land: A Democratic Economics for the Year 2000*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Domhoff, G. William. 2013. *The Myth of Liberal Ascendancy: Corporate Dominance from the Great Depression to the Great Recession*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Hartmann, Heidi I., and Ann R. Markusen. 1980. "Contemporary Marxist Theory and Practice: A Feminist Critique." *Review of Radical Political Economics* 12, no. 2: 87–94.
- Jeong, Seongjin. 1997. "The Social Structure of Accumulation in South Korea: Upgrading or Crumbling?" *Review of Radical Political Economics* 29, no. 4: 92–112.
- Kim, Marlene. 2018. "URPE at UC Berkeley: The Activities, Protests, and Legacy of the Economics Students and URPE's Once Largest Chapter." *Review of Radical Political Economics* 50, no. 3: 522–33.
- Kotz, David M. 1987. "Long Waves and Social Structures of Accumulation: A Critique and Reinterpretation." *Review of Radical Political Economics* 19, no. 4: 16–38.
- Kotz, David M. 2017. "Social Structure of Accumulation Theory, Marxist Theory, and System Transformation." *Review of Radical Political Economics* 49, no. 4: 534–42.
- Kotz, David M., Terrence McDonough, and Michael Reich, eds. 1994. *Social Structures of Accumulation: The Political Economy of Growth and Crisis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marglin, Stephen A. 1974. "What Do Bosses Do? The Origins and Function of Hierarchy in Capitalist Production." *Review of Radical Political Economics* 6, no. 2: 60–112.
- Matthaei, Julie. 2018. "URPE, Radical Political Economics, Social Movements, and Revolution – Identity Politics to Solidarity Economics: Looking Backward, Looking Forward on the Occasion of URPE's Fiftieth Anniversary." *Review of Radical Political Economics* 50, no. 3: 504–21.
- McDonough, Terrence, Michael Reich, and David M. Kotz, eds. 2010. *Contemporary Capitalism and its Crises: Social Structure of Accumulation Theory for the 21st Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McIntyre, Richard and Michael Hillard. 2013. "Capitalist Class Agency and the New Deal Order: Against the Notion of a Limited Capital-Labor Accord." *Review of Radical Political Economics* 45, no. 2: 129–48.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1959. *The Sociological Imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Mutari, Ellen. 2001. "'... As Broad as Our life Experience': Visions of Feminist Political Economy, 1972–1991." *Review of Radical Political Economics* 33, no. 4: 379–99.
- Quick, Paddy. 1977. "The Class Nature of Women's Oppression." *Review of Radical Economics* 9, no. 3: 42–53.
- Wolfson, Martin H. and David M. Kotz. 2010. "A Reconceptualization of Social Structure Accumulation Theory." *World Review of Political Economy* 1, no. 2: 209–25.

55. *Science & Society*

Science & Society (S&S) can be viewed in a variety of ways: as an archive of the rich Marxist tradition, as a true interdisciplinary journal that refuses to change its core values to accommodate the new data driven publication system, and as a historical database of the important debates which have concerned the working-class movement and intellectuals throughout the long twentieth century. A historical publication of the international left, *Science & Society* is one of the oldest, most prestigious, and the most consistent publications of the Marxist tradition in the world (in any language), combining the intellectual rigor and meticulousness of academic life, and at the same time giving a political and epistemic battle for the benefit of the working population across the world.

Science & Society was founded in 1936 and has never ceased to provide important scholarly work, both for academic audiences and the broader public. S&S was founded for the purpose of developing and growing Marxist scholarship at a time when “anti-red” and “anti-communist” policies by governments and universities obstructed the free exchange of ideas on campuses. With the advent of the economic hardships of the Great Depression, teachers and university staff started organizing around salaries, and the ability of the faculty to have a say in the management of their workplace. The development of these ideas followed a growing number of communist cells within universities, although clandestine in nature. These were critical developments that led to the creation of the journal. To this end, and to avoid any confusion about its identity, the journal inserted the subtitle “A Marxian Quarterly” underneath its title (*Science & Society* 1936, 1, no. 1: i–ii).

S&S was never just another academic journal, it had always been linked with political developments outside academia which influenced its course and content (Goldway 1986). For example, the journal has accompanied the scientific community and its relation to the labor movement in an attempt to wage war against Nazism and Fascism during World War II. In the midst of the war efforts, entries such as “The Utilization of Scientists in the United States” (by Harry Grundfest) and “Centralized Control of War

Production” (by Earl Browder) sought to explain the management of scientific work needed to win the war, as well as map the advances of scientific inquiry and the state of science generally, albeit primarily in the United States, where the journal is published. Following World War II, the anti-communist hysteria of the 1950s influenced its path, as subscriptions declined and members of the editorial board either had to withdraw from the journal or write under pseudonyms. Readers often asked to be removed from subscription lists and preferred instead to buy the journal anonymously at a newsstand. However, as the social struggles of the 1960s gained momentum, S&S experienced a resurgence in popularity. As university enrollments expanded rapidly during this period, new graduate students and younger faculty members led a surge in subscriptions during the late 1960s and 1970s. S&S became a reference point for giving voice to Marxist critiques of the capitalist order in its many facets of expression and development.

S&S has been unapologetically internationalist in stance and scope, giving voice to critiques of actually existing capitalism and the superstructures arising from the material conditions of that economic structure. At the same time, the journal has been critical of existing positions within the Marxist intelligentsia and the working-class movement; for example, the development of biology in the Soviet Union or, more recently, revisiting Eco-socialist perspectives in light of environmental deterioration. S&S has been a major source of material critical of the Lysenko affair. At a time when the dissolution of the Soviet Union had a great impact on the attractiveness of Marxist approaches, the communicative (linguistic) turn and micro-sociological and anthropological approaches to social science did not change the editorial trajectory of the journal. S&S remained steadfastly Marxist when doing so made it difficult to sustain an academic career.

However, the journal’s approach has been generally against defining Marxism in precise terms, embracing all interpretation and approaches. In the words of its editors, S&S

invite as contributors not only those who have already accepted and applied Marxian principles to their researches, but also those who are exploring its possibilities. They desire

to publish as many forthright Marxian articles as possible, but they regard Marxism as a dynamic, ever-developing movement of thought to which many minds must contribute, and solicit the active cooperation of all who are interested in its progress ... The journal thus hopes to open up new fields for investigation and to stimulate scholars to adopt the fruitful methods of Marxism.

The journal has been a platform for important debates within Marxist political economy, and related fields of scientific inquiry, which include education, physics, sociology, cultural studies, arts, literature, and philosophy. An example of this generalist approach was evident from the very first publication, which included pieces on a wide range of fields, such as “American Education and the Social Struggle,” which highlighted the class character of education. In the very same issue, other pieces included “Concerning Mathematics,” “An Evaluation of Logical Positivism,” and “The Social Basis of Linguistics.” This path was followed purposefully in order to assert the multidisciplinary character of Marxism, and to emphasize the limited capacity of existing social theories. Therefore, the journal has always provided an opportunity for Marxist scholars to publish their work in an academic publication, while at the same time emphasizing the interdisciplinary nature of Marxism as compared to other theoretical traditions.

In this respect, the journal has been a critical platform for the development of academic Marxism to flourish by giving intellectuals the opportunity to publish work that otherwise be dismissed as political pamphleteering or partisan political analysis. The journal has always emphasized rigorous analysis in academic work as a way to develop ideas better and to remain independent in terms of party politics. The independence of the journal was predicated on the idea that it would avoid getting embroiled in conflicts within Marxism and left political parties, while engaging in fruitful debates that would advance critique and counter-arguments to the hegemonic ideas and narratives about capitalist society.

LEANDROS SAVVIDES

References

- Browder, E. 1943. “Centralized Control of War Production.” *Science & Society* 7, no. 1: 56–63.
- “Editorial Statement.” 1936. *Science & Society* 1, no. 1: i–ii.
- Goldway, D. 1986. “Fifty Years of ‘Science & Society’.” *Science & Society* 50, no. 3: 260–79.
- Grundfest, H. 1943. “The Utilization of Scientists in the United States.” *Science & Society* 7, no. 1: 24–31.
- Orbeli, L. A. 1943. “The Development of Biology in the Soviet Union.” *Science & Society* 7, no. 3: 205–16.
- Schwartzman, D. and Di Mauro, S. E. 2022. “Ecosocialist Theory: Analysis and Prospects.” *Science & Society* 86, no. 4: 479–84.

56. *Signs: journal of women in culture and society*

Signs was launched in 1975, in the midst of the Cold War, the same year that the United Nations sponsored its first world conferences on women in Mexico City (June) and East Berlin (October). At a time when research on women was radically absent from scholarly journals, Jean Sacks, Head of the Journals Division at the University of Chicago Press, recruited Catharine Stimpson (then Associate Professor of English at Barnard) to serve as Founding Editor of a bold intellectual venture. Refusing the boundaries established by traditional academic journals, *Signs* declared its animating purpose “to publish new scholarship about women as a means to understand large patterns of human behavior, institutions, ideologies, art” – in short, all aspects of human existence (Stimpson et al. 1975, v). Embracing interdisciplinarity, the journal set out to demonstrate that sustained investigation of women’s lives would transform the known world, particularly as it was being taught in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences in Western universities. Aspiring to escape bipolar politics of the Cold War, Stimpson appointed an international advisory board and published reports from various regions of the globe as a regular feature of the journal.

The initial approach to interdisciplinarity, however, was discipline-based. Each volume included a series of review essays that charted “new scholarship” in the social sciences (anthropology, economics, political science, psychology, sociology, urban planning), humanities (art history, architecture, history, literary criticism, philosophy), and the natural sciences. Analysing journal content within a disciplinary frame, political science was underrepresented. In the first 30 years, 10 percent of the articles published in the journal were political science, compared to 25 percent literary criticism, 21 percent history, and 12 percent sociology; the proportion increased to 17 percent between 2005 and 2015.

But it would be a mistake to conflate *Signs*’ contributions to political studies with discipline-based articles. As an integral component of feminist analysis, feminist theory

permeates the content of the journal, contesting established terms of debate, recasting traditional concepts, introducing new analytical frames, constructing new objects of inquiry, and charting new directions for research. Jettisoning liberal democratic notions of a neutral, if not benign state, for example, Catharine MacKinnon (1983, 644) theorized the state and its most powerful product, the law, as inherently male, noting that the state “coercively and authoritatively constitutes the social order in the interests of men ... through legitimating norms, forms, relations to society, and substantive policies.” Indeed, as a site that institutionalizes male norms, perceptions, and desires as the “natural” order of things, the state, MacKinnon argued, has not been and never will be a site for liberation.

Signs cultivated an interdisciplinary feminist epistemic community that forged research practices attuned to power dynamics in domains that political science deemed apolitical. Breaking with the tenets of positivism, editorial policy encouraged modes of inquiry committed to social change, suggesting that discoveries and conclusions should be used to improve the material conditions of women’s lives. The scope of the desired transformation was ambitious, ranging from individual consciousness and interpersonal relations to social institutions (families, schools, universities, religions, nations, traditions), political organizations (local, municipal, state, regional, national, international), regimes of power (racism, sexism, heteronormativity, ableism, ethnocentrism, ethnic chauvinism, imperialism), as well as academic disciplines.

From its inception, scholars publishing in *Signs* avowed their feminist politics and struggled with a host of methodological and epistemological issues surrounding the relation of politics to knowledge production. Unlike methodologies that purport to be value-neutral, which explicitly deny any political dimension to scientific inquiry, feminist researchers acknowledge that particular political convictions inspire their work. As a political movement, feminism seeks to eliminate domination (e.g., gender, class, racial, heterosexual, geopolitical) in all of its manifestations. Explicating how feminist principles could contribute to academic research, Adrienne Rich (2003, 454) noted that “a politicized life ought to sharpen both the senses and the memory.” The sharpening that Rich alludes to involves a way of

attending to dimensions of existence often overlooked in traditional academic accounts. Feminist convictions attune scholars to power dynamics that structure diverse women's lives. By making power dynamics visible and probing silences, absences, and distortions in dominant paradigms, feminist inquiry challenges established explanatory accounts and identifies new questions for research. As Alison Wylie (2003, 38) pointed out

It is the political commitment that feminists bring to diverse fields that motivates them to focus attention on lines of evidence others have not sought out or thought important; to discern patterns others have ignored; to question androcentric or sexist framework assumptions that have gone unnoticed or unchallenged; and sometimes to significantly reframe the research agenda of their discipline in light of different questions or an expanded repertoire of explanatory hypotheses.

Articles in *Signs* investigate mainstream and feminist scholarship, advancing systematic critiques of bias in theoretical assumptions, interpretive strategies, genres, styles of representation, rhetoric of inquiry, problem selection, standards of evidence, models of explanation, research design, data collection, analysis of results, narrative strategies, and discursive formations. Contributors call attention to damage done by false universals, biological determinism, essentialism, a colonizing gaze, heteronormativity, and insensitivity to race, class, ethnicity, disability, nationality, and other critical markers of difference. To dispel the notion that the world could be understood on the basis of any single measure, the journal often juxtaposes multiple analyses of topics, demonstrating the role of methodology in constituting the research object, and thereby unmasking pretenses of scientism and excessive philosophical generalization, which collude in the naturalization of social roles, relations, and structures. By orchestrating interdisciplinary and transnational conversations about important issues, the journal maps an alternative conception of objectivity – providing opportunities to think within and through multiple, competing theoretical and methodological frameworks that contradict and contest one another, acknowledge and engage incompatible presuppositions, structure similarities and disparateness,

explore alternative worldviews, and probe horizons of expectation.

Signs' editors commissioned special issues, critical debates, interdisciplinary forums, provocative viewpoint essays and comparative perspectives symposia that contributed significantly to the field of feminist studies. The topics covered in the first 45 years indicate how the journal expanded understandings of the political. From its first special issue in 1975 on *Power*, subsequent issues addressed power dynamics related to sexual practices; gendered performances; the terms and conditions of sexual exchange; the asymmetries of power in public and private spheres; the politics of reproduction; the distributions of types of work; the organization of domestic activity; the divisions of paid and unpaid labor; structures of the formal, informal, subsistence and care economies; the segregation of labor markets; patterns of production and consumption; terms and conditions of labor exchange; opportunities for education, employment, and promotion; the politics of representation; the structures and outcomes of public decision making; the operating procedures of regulatory and redistributive agencies; the dynamics of diasporas and decolonization; the potent contradictions of globalization, war making, and militarization; as well as women's manifold resistances against oppressive forces structuring and constraining their life prospects.

Through trenchant critiques and continuing exchanges, authors called into question the most basic categories of feminist analysis, including "woman," "women," "gender," "sexuality," "class," "race," "nation," and indeed, "feminism" itself. With each successive year, *Signs'* contributors developed innovative research questions by problematizing the given and denaturalizing the taken for granted.

Signs engaged particularly fraught issues in a timely manner. The journal published the transformative essay on "The Costs of Exclusionary Practices in Women's Studies" by Maxine Baca Zinn, Lynn Weber, Elizabeth Higginbotham, and Bonnie Dill Thornton (1986) at a time when the National Women's Studies Association was imploding over the issue. In the late 1980s, essays in *Signs* marked the tensions between the ascendancy of postmodernism across a range of disciplines and pressing demands by scholars of color to devote sustained attention to

womanism, Black women's studies, Black women's leadership, racism and aesthetics, Black women in poverty, and the social construction of Black feminist thought (Collins 1989). As proponents of capitalism proclaimed "the end of history" with the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1989 (Fukuyama 1992), *Signs*' authors began tracking economic and political transformations that disproportionately harmed women: gendered processes of globalization and democratization, feminization and casualization of labor forces, and "womenomics" (i.e., economic policies that impose new burdens on women who are expected to assume responsibilities in the formal, informal, subsistence, and care economies).

Essays demonstrated that neoliberalism had complex negative effects in authoritarian, liberal democratic, social-democratic, and socialist states, shrinking the public sector and curtailing social services such as education and health care as well as women's employment in social service agencies. Regional wars in the Balkans, Rwanda, Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and Sudan raised new charges of genocide, as rape was deployed as a tactical weapon. Terrorism moved from the shatter zones of a bi-polar world to the center of global politics. *Signs* explored these challenges through "Comparative Perspectives Symposia" that featured four to 12 contributors from various regions of the globe.

Feminist theorizations of violence jumped scale. Like feminist activism in the 1970s and 1980s, feminist scholarship in *Signs* documented the prevalence of rape, dispelled the myth of stranger rape, and conceptualized a feminist response to crimes against women. Shattering the silence surrounding domestic violence, feminist scholars conceptualized marital rape, intimate violence, family violence, and childhood sexual abuse. In the twenty-first century, feminist scholars turned their analytic lenses to gendered violence on a global scale, theorizing the logic of masculinist protection that feminizes whole citizenries in a homeland security state (Young 2003), rape as an instrument in war (Bos 2006), the raced-gendered logics and effects of war (Hawkesworth and Alexander 2007a, 2007b), the complex interconnections between ordinary (peacetime) and extraordinary (wartime) violence (George 2007), and

necropolitics in the context of femicide and genocide (Gobodo-Madikizela et al. 2014).

From its earliest days, *Signs* recognized that traditional journals excluded vast amounts of evidence and experience from accredited knowledge and thereby served hegemonic interests. To subvert those interests, feminist inquiry generates theories, concepts, and analytical categories that expand what counts as evidence. The sophisticated scholarship published in the journal enables re/vision, a kind of "seeing again" that revisits the past and present in order to know them differently and by knowing them differently to change the future (Plate 2008).

MARY E. HAWKESWORTH

References

- Bos, Pascal. 2006. "Feminists Interpreting the Politics of Wartime Rape: Berlin, 1945; Yugoslavia, 1992–1993." *Signs* 31, no. 4: 995–1025.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 1989. "The Social Construction of Black Feminist Thought." *Signs* 14, no. 4: 745–73.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 1992. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press.
- George, Rosemary Marangoly. 2007. "(Extra) ordinary Violence: National Literatures, Diasporic Aesthetics, and the Politics of Gender in South Asian Partition Fiction." *Signs* 33, no. 1: 135–58.
- Gobodo-Madikizela, Pumla, Jennifer Fish, and Tamara Shefer. 2014. "Gendered Violence: Continuities and Transformation in the Aftermath of Conflict in Africa." *Signs* 40, no. 1: 81–99.
- Hawkesworth, Mary and Karen Alexander, eds. 2007a. *War and Terror I: Raced-Gendered Logics and Effects in Conflict Zones*. Special issue of *Signs* 32, no. 4.
- Hawkesworth, Mary and Karen Alexander, eds. 2007b. *War and Terror II: Raced-Gendered Logics and Effects beyond Conflict Zones*. Special issue of *Signs* 33, no. 1.
- MacKinnon, Catharine A. 1982. "Feminism, Marxism, Method, and the State: Toward Feminist Jurisprudence." *Signs* 8, no. 8: 635–58.
- Plate, Liedeke. 2008. "Remembering the Future; or, Whatever Happened to Re-Vision?" *Signs* 33, no. 2: 389–41.
- Rich, Adrienne. 2003. "Notes Toward a Politics of Location." In *Feminist Theory Reader: Local and Global Perspectives*, edited by Carol McCann and Seung-Kyung Kim, 447–59. New York: Routledge.
- Stimpson, Catharine, Joan N. Burstyn, Domna C. Stanton, and Sandra M. Whisler. 1975. "Editorial." *Signs* 1, no. 1: v–viii.

MARY E. HAWKESWORTH

Wylie, Alison. 2003. "Why Standpoint Matters." In *Science and Other Cultures: Issues in Philosophies of Science and Technology*, edited by Robert Figueroa and Sandra G. Harding, 26–48. New York: Routledge.

Young, Iris Marion. 2003. "The Logic of Masculinist Protection: Reflections on the Current Security State." *Signs* 29, no. 1: 1–25.

See also

Feminist Review; *Hypatia*; *International Feminist Journal of Politics*; Mary Hawkesworth; Iris Marion Young; Catharine A. MacKinnon

57. *Socialism and Democracy*

Socialism and Democracy (S&D) straddles the boundary between academia and activism, committed in the words of its 2005 Mission Statement: “to showing the continuing relevance of socialist politics and vision,” through analysis of “the core issues and popular movements of our time.” Its scope is global, its approach multi-disciplinary, and its perspective “broadly Marxist, ... seeking to integrate issues of race, gender, sexuality, ethnicity and nationality with the traditional focus on class.” The journal frequently produces special issues with guest editors. The journal is not affiliated with any political grouping.

The journal’s first issue appeared in 1985. Its sponsoring organization, the Research Group on Socialism and Democracy (RGSD), was founded the previous year at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. It was housed in the Graduate Center’s sociology department and was co-chaired by CUNY professors Michael E. Brown (sociology) and Frank Rosengarten (literary studies). The journal remained self-sustaining until 2005, producing usually two issues per year, typeset by managing editor Eric Canepa. Since that time, when production was contracted to Routledge Journals, it has published three issues per year.

The Research Group’s founding event (in October 1984) featured a lecture by Eric Hobsbawm, billed as the first of a series of lectures that would focus on the relationship of democracy to socialism. This was part of a planned set of RGSD activities which initially centered not around producing a journal but rather around facilitating collaboration among various study centers and research projects. Hobsbawm’s talk (reported on by Rosengarten in S&D 1:1, 1985) conveyed a political approach shared by the organizers which, while critical of existing embodiments of socialism, nonetheless maintained that any future advance toward democracy would require a socialist framework, understanding socialism as entailing the breakup or dissolution of capitalist class-relations. In the interim, a vital task would be to provide a kind of clearinghouse for all the energy, insights, and resources on the Left that up to

then had operated – whether locally, nationally, or internationally – in relative isolation from one another.

The concerns that pervaded the first few years of *Socialism and Democracy* were brought together in a landmark November 1989 conference organized by RGSD to mark the seventieth anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party USA. The RGSD’s approach to the conference had been articulated in a two-part article by Michael Brown (S&D #4 [3:1] and #5 [3:2], 1987) on the historiography of U.S. Communism (see Brown 1993), and was also reflected in S&D articles by other authors, focusing not only on the U.S. experience but also on the status of socialist movements around the world. The Soviet bloc drew particular attention in view of the ongoing processes of *Perestroika* (restructuring) and *Glasnost* (opening) being implemented at the time under the leadership of Soviet CP General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev. With regard to both the CPUSA and the Soviet Union, S&D writers supported the rising democratic currents but at the same time recognized that socialist movements, in looking to the future, need to come to terms with all aspects of socialism’s past. This meant on the one hand addressing the negative dimensions of that past by seeking to understand their genesis rather than trying to disown them. On the other hand, especially in view of the continuing impact of anti-communism in the U.S., it meant reminding readers of the too easily forgotten *positive* contributions of the CP, especially to building the U.S. labor movement and to shattering racist taboos (see Naison 1993).

S&D’s critical approach to the socialist past took on particular importance in the context of the collapse of the Soviet and East European Communist regimes – a process that generated considerable pressure in the U.S. for people to stop viewing socialism as a viable option (see Brown & Rosengarten 1990). All the journal’s issues from #9 through #17 (Vols. 5–8, 1989–92) featured an opening section entitled “Socialism in Transition: Documents and Discussion.” This large set of articles, which includes contributions from the Soviet Union, Poland, and the German Democratic Republic as well as the United States, reflects an extraordinary moment of collective introspection, framed by uncertainty as to the fate of societies in which undemocratic and seemingly immuta-

ble regimes governing in the name of socialism were suddenly collapsing. The upshot was a distinctive mix of disillusionment and hope, prompting complex projections (see Wallis 1990).

Publication of S&D was suspended in 1993 when Frank Rosengarten reduced his role. Meanwhile, Michael Brown moved to the Boston area and assembled a new editorial collective which resumed publication in 1995, giving way in 1998 to a larger editorial board centered in New York but led by Victor Wallis of the Boston group. The enlarged board drew in some of S&D's other early participants as well as (among others) individuals who had worked with the New York Marxist School. The board would continue to grow and diversify in the ensuing years. Wallis, a political science professor at the Berklee College of Music, remained as managing editor through 2017, when he stepped down in favor of Suren Moodliar, a long-time organizer with graduate training in political science and urban planning (see Moodliar and Wallis 2018). George Snedeker, who had been in the original RGSD group at CUNY, became book review editor in 2009. (For complete listing of board members, see <https://sdonline.org/about-us>.)

The first of S&D's many special issues was the double issue comprising Volume 12 (##23/24, 1998), consisting of articles written to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the Communist Manifesto, many of them presented at conferences in Paris and New York, and all highlighting the continuing vitality of Marxism in the wake of the perceived setbacks of 1989–91. A culminating event of the New York Marxist School's "Manifestivity" was a roundtable on "The Future of the Left" attended by 900 people and featuring a multi-disciplinary conversation (moderated by Steve Brier) between Maria Helena Moreira Alves, Barbara Fields, Stephen Jay Gould, Richard Levins, Daniel Singer, Cornel West, and Ellen Meiksins Wood – transcript published in S&D #25 (13:1, 1999).

A distinctive feature of S&D has been its ongoing coverage of the Cuban Revolution, drawing especially on the contacts and expertise of board-members Al Campbell, Peter Roman, Rainer Schultz, Hobart Spalding, and several outside specialists on Cuba. Issues #29 (15:1, 2001), #52 (24:1, 2010), #60 (26:3, 2012), and #70 (30:1, 2016) are all devoted

wholly or in large part to Cuba, consisting mostly of articles by Cuban social scientists living on the island. The general perspective is thus one of critical analysis from within the revolutionary project. Also noteworthy is a special section in #32 (16:2, 2002) on the Cuban Five (imprisoned in the U.S. for secretly monitoring counterrevolutionary Cuban exiles on behalf of the Cuban government), including statements to the court by two of the defendants. S&D #34 (17:2, 2003) carries articles by CIA whistleblower Philip Agee on U.S. agents in Cuba and by Cuban Five defense lawyer Leonard Weinglass on the railroading of his clients. Issue #37 (19:1, 2005) has a polemic by Richard Levins entitled "Progressive Cuba-Bashing"; #38 (19:2, 2005) has Peter Roman's account of the Cuban lawmaking process; and in #70 (30:1, 2016) Al Campbell gives an overview of Cuban prospects on the occasion of the country's new constitution.

S&D board-member Gerardo Rénique edited two special issues on Latin America as a whole (#39, 19:3, 2005, and #51, 23:3, 2009) and a special section on the Oaxaca (Mexico) uprising of 2006 (#44, 21:2, 2007). As with S&D's Cuba coverage, most of the writers in these issues are natives of the countries or regions they write about. The title of #39, *The Reawakening of Revolution in Latin America*, suggests the pertinence of its contents to an understanding of the "pink tide" that arose beginning with the revolutionary social programs launched by Hugo Chávez in Venezuela.

S&D has carried on a multi-pronged discussion of developments in China, including a debate on Chinese Marxism in #30 (15:2, 2001), a special section on "Class Struggles in China" in #44 (21:2, 2007), articles by two Chinese dissident Marxist philosophers in #58 (26:1, 2012), additional historical articles by Robert Weil (#41, 20:2, 2006, and #61, 27:1, 2013), "Reflections on Chinese Marxism" (also in #61) by Robert Ware, and an article by Timothy Kerswell and Jake Lin entitled "Capitalism Denied with Chinese Characteristics" (#74, 31:2, 2017).

A major topic over the years, thanks especially to the initiative of S&D board-member Yusuf Nuruddin, has been the political economy of racism. Nuruddin organized and contributed to a discussion on Reparations in S&D #31 (16:1, 2002) and then, together with Ronald Hayduk and Victor Wallis, edited

a 400-page special issue entitled *Radical Perspectives on Race and Racism* (#33, 17:1, 2003), drawing in part on presentations by well-known panelists at a New York Marxist School conference observing the centenary of W.E.B. Du Bois's classic *The Souls of Black Folk*. This was followed in 2004 by a 300-page collection entitled *Hip Hop, Race, and Cultural Politics* (#36, 18:2), drawing on Nuruddin's wide contacts and co-edited by him with Wallis. The articles and interviews in this issue bring out, among other things, the deep political drive underlying hip hop and its tense coexistence with aspirations for commercial success.

Another angle on racism is explored in a 2008 special issue edited by board-member Jonathan Scott, entitled *US Fascism Comes to the Surface* (#47, 22:2). Presaging what would become common knowledge with the subsequent rise of Donald Trump, Scott and his contributors situate the origins of U.S. fascism squarely in the white supremacist practices that dominated the South in the post-Reconstruction period (see Scott 2008).

A further S&D contribution to racism studies is the 300-page special issue from 2011, *What Is African American Studies, Its Focus, and Future?* (#55, 25:1), co-edited by Nuruddin with philosopher John H. McClendon III. This volume offers a wide range of views as to the sufficiency of Marxist method for comprehending the African American experience. While all the authors are critical of capitalism, they vary in their degree of interest in Afrocentric themes. A comparable mix is present in S&D's collection, assembled by philosopher Teodros Kiroso, on *Democracy, Philosophy and Social Movements in Africa* (#45, 21:3, 2007).

For S&D #66 (28:3, 2014), board-member Johanna Fernández teamed up with journalist and political prisoner Mumia Abu-Jamal to edit a special issue entitled *The Roots of Mass Incarceration in the US: Locking up Black Dissidents and Punishing the Poor*, which was launched to an audience of over 200 in Harlem's Audubon Ballroom. Finally, an editorial team including historians Gerald Horne and Philip Luke Sinitiere put together a special issue (#78, 32:3, 2018) entitled *Socialism and Democracy in W.E.B. Du Bois's Life, Thought, and Legacy*, which sheds new light on Du Bois's later years.

Numerous other focused issues of the journal were produced. Board-member

Hester Eisenstein edited a special section, *Gender and Globalization: Marxist-Feminist Perspectives* (#35, 18:1, 2004), featuring analyses of Mozambique, Nicaragua, and Sweden, as well as theoretical articles addressing religious fundamentalism, movement-building, and the role of the state. Another initiative of Yusuf Nuruddin led, with the advisory help of Darko Suvin and the editorial collaboration of science fiction critic Alcena M.D. Rogan, to a special issue entitled *Socialism and Social Critique in Science Fiction* (#42, 20:3, 2006), a topic of particular interest in view of the potential of science fiction to convey a revolutionary vision to audiences that are not always attuned to politics. In 2008, following a national upsurge of immigrant activism, S&D produced a special issue *Radical Perspectives on Immigration* (#48, 22:3), co-edited by board-members Marcella Bencivenni and Ron Hayduk, in which issues of cultural assimilation and class-wide alliances are explored in the light of history.

Two special issues initiated by board-member Marcello Musto were subsequently published as books (Musto 2012; Comninel et al. 2015). The first of these (#54, 24:3, 2010) includes articles on "Re-reading Marx in 2010" and a section of reports on the current reception of Marx throughout Asia, Europe, and the Americas. The second, co-edited with George Comninel and Victor Wallis (#65, 28:2, 2014), combines historical studies and documents of the First International with interviews of labor leaders on present-day global solidarity. Two other collections by board-members that became books are: Mat Callahan's special section, *Radical Perspectives on Intellectual Property* (#64, 28:1, 2014; Callahan and Rogers 2017), and Babak Amini's special issue *The Radical Left in Europe* (#69, 29:3, 2015; Amini 2016), the latter of which features articles by authors from every European country or region.

Other featured topics have included: a special section on the Occupy Movement (#59, 26:2, 2012), a special section "From Democracy Movement to Socialist Democracy" (#67, 29:1, 2015), a special issue on *The Energy Transition* edited by Suren Moodliar with Weimin Tchen and Dave Burt (#71, 30:2, 2016), and a special issue entitled *Movements at the Millennium: Seattle + 20*, co-edited by movement scholars Ben Manski and Hillary Lazar (#81, 34:1, 2020). The

latter two issues both include interviews with activists as well as analytic articles.

A distinctive occasional feature of S&D has been the inclusion of poetry, beginning with Bertolt Brecht's 400-line rendition of the Communist Manifesto, as translated with accompanying commentary by Darko Suvin (#31, 16:1, 2002). D.H. Melhem joined the S&D board as poetry editor in 2008, contributing and securing several distinguished works over the next few years (in ##47–50). Additional poems appear in #72 (30:3, 2016) and #83/84 (34:2/3, 2020), all adding a dimension of depth to the journal's core political arguments.

Under Suren Moodliar's leadership (since 2018), S&D has re-assumed, while continuing its regular publishing activities, some of the direct movement-building mission that marked the journal's earliest years. With board-member Liz Mestres, Moodliar has upgraded the website, adding to it a blog that encourages brief responses by board-members and others to issues of current interest. Over recent years, the editorial board has become increasingly dispersed geographically, so meetings are now conducted remotely over multiple time-zones. At the same time, with the onset of COVID-19 and the need for new modes of outreach, board-members Linda Liu, Suren Moodliar, and Joseph G. Ramsey together initiated an online video program called "Shelter & Solidarity," hosted by Ramsey, which sponsors frequent panel discussions that have attracted well-known activists, scholars, writers, and poets outside S&D's immediate circle. The possibility of putting on a conference on the scale of RGSD's 1989 event is once again on the table.

VICTOR WALLIS

References

- Amini, Babak, ed. 2016. *The Radical Left in Europe in the Age of Austerity*. London: Routledge.
- Brown, Michael E. 1993. "The History of the History of U.S. Communism." In *New Studies in the Politics and Culture of U.S. Communism*, edited by Michael E. Brown, Randy Martin, Frank Rosengarten, and George Snedeker, 15–44. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Brown, Michael E., and Frank Rosengarten. 1990. "Editorial." *Socialism and Democracy* No. 10 (6:1): iii–xix.
- Brown, Michael E., Randy Martin, Frank Rosengarten, and George Snedeker. 1993. *New Studies in the Politics and Culture of U.S. Communism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Callahan, Mat, and Jim Rogers, eds. 2017. *A Critical Guide to Intellectual Property*. London: Zed.
- Comninel, George C., Marcello Musto, and Victor Wallis, eds. 2015. *The International after 150 Years: Labor vs. Capital, Then and Now*. London: Routledge.
- Moodliar, Suren, and Victor Wallis. 2018. "Socialism and Democracy: A Conversation." *Socialism and Democracy* No. 76 (32:1): 152–73.
- Musto, Marcello, ed. 2012. *Marx for Today*. London: Routledge.
- Naison, Mark. 1993. "Remaking America: Communists and Liberals in the Popular Front." In *New Studies in the Politics and Culture of U.S. Communism*, edited by Michael E. Brown, Randy Martin, Frank Rosengarten, and George Snedeker, 45–73. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Scott, Jonathan. 2008. "Why Fascism When They Have White Supremacy?" *Socialism and Democracy* No 47 (22:2): 73–107.
- Wallis, Victor. 1990. "Marxism in the Age of Gorbachev." *Socialism and Democracy* No. 11 (6:2): 47–73.
- Wallis, Victor. 2020. *Socialist Practice: Histories and Theories*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

See also

Victor Wallis; Historical Marxism; Communism; Socialism

58. *Socialist Register*

The *Socialist Register* is an annual publication covering the fields of politics, economics, socialist theory, and culture. It was founded in 1964 by Ralph Miliband and John Saville as “an annual survey of movements and ideas” from the standpoint of the independent New Left. It subsequently had a long tenure under the editorship of Leo Panitch, alongside Miliband, Colin Leys, and others, until Panitch’s death in 2020. It is currently edited by Greg Albo, in conjunction with the editorial support of Colin Leys, Alfredo Saad-Filho, Nicole Aschoff, Steve Maher, Alan Zuege, and an editorial collective of scholars in Africa, Asia, Europe, and the Americas.

Since 1984, each annual volume has been focused on a topical theme characterized by essays offering sustained analyses that cut across intellectual disciplines, geographical boundaries, and socialist political traditions. The *Socialist Register* is published annually by Merlin Press in the United Kingdom, Monthly Review Press in the United States, and Fernwood Books in Canada, and also as an online edition available with the archive at <https://socialistregister.com/>.

Editorial history

With the emergence of the British New Left, various political currents found intellectual expression in the different journals established during the 1950s and 1960s. The *New Reasoner* and *Universities and Left Review* merged into the *New Left Review* in 1960, but soon after former members of the *New Reasoner*, including E.P. Thompson, John Saville, and Ralph Miliband saw the need for a new outlet for their ideas and politics. This founding story is told in some detail by Miliband’s partner, Marion Kozak (1995), and by Lin Chun, a close friend of Kozak and Miliband and editorial colleague of the *Register*, in her book on *The British New Left* (1994).

It was Miliband who first proposed the format of a book length annual in 1963. In a memorandum dated 7th April 1963, Miliband wrote:

I proposed that Edward Thompson, John Saville and myself should publish a socialist

annual between 300 and 400 pages in length, which would include articles on socialist theory and practice, labour history and contemporary events; book reviews and reviews of socialist classics; a calendar of events of interest to socialists; and a review of the year in relation to labour and socialist movements around the world; plus a review of important events of the year, analysed, like all else, in a socialist perspective ... Both John Saville and I had no doubt that a socialist annual that was not an annual of record was a rather unusual type of publication on the Left, and that it would not make possible the kind of prompt response to events which could more easily be managed in a monthly, bi-monthly or quarterly journal. On the other hand, we hoped that an annual would allow a more reflective and measured type of essay. Also, an annual would provide the space for articles of a length that journals could not normally accept. (quoted in Miliband 1994, 1–2; cf. Newman 2002)

The wide scope and more activist orientation of the publication was to be captured in its sub-title: “A Survey of Movements and Ideas.” The original idea for the *Socialist Register*’s name came from Martin Eve at Merlin Press, who had in mind the *Political Register*, a nineteenth-century newspaper founded by radical journalist William Cobbett. Politically, Miliband positioned the *Register* outside of existing orthodoxies as he sought to define and expand the new political space of an independent socialist left.

In Kozak’s (1995, 278–9) recounting of the agenda established by Miliband and Saville:

The concern to interpret anew, but rigorously and relevantly, the politics of Marx became the hallmark of the politics of the *Register*, theory, by all means, but theory that bore relevance to the editors’ preoccupations with contemporary politics. The *Register* was a journal which, among others, contributed to reviving a meaningful debate about Marxist theory away from the old calcified base-superstructure debates, while expressing scepticism about new ‘structuralist’ interpretations which soon became fashionable ... The *Socialist Register*’s contribution to the revitalisation of Marxism was much enhanced by the resolute internationalism that characterized the project.

Given the New Left context of the Cold War and the splits in the socialist movement, it was impossible for Miliband and Saville to leave to the side the political positioning the

Register set for itself. As Kozak (1995, 282) recalled:

A difficult question arises as to who were the *Register*'s editors and authors and where they stood politically? The successful publication of annual volumes was largely due to an unspoken agreement between the editors as to what constituted 'being on the Left' – an agreement which had already integrated unequivocal opposition not only to Stalin but to Stalinism of every kind, as well as an overall acceptance of the basic tenets of socialism/communism and a clearly Marxist perspective ... And yet, the *Register* was an open forum for many socialist thinkers of different persuasions, with the editors participating frequently in debates with the Communist Party as well as the Trotskyite groups. The *Register* consequently attracted some world famous socialist theorists who were politically homeless. The *Register* became one of the havens, a sort of missing persons' bureau, for the non-aligned Left.

For the first two decades, the *Socialist Register* was edited by Miliband and Saville, with the exception of the 1982 volume which was edited by Martin Eve and David Musson from Merlin Press. In 1984, Marcel Liebman became a third co-editor, and with the double volume of 1985/86, Leo Panitch became a fourth editor. The 1984 volume also marked a transition to producing each volume around a specific theme of political importance to current socialist movements and theory, with interventions from authors from around the world.

After Marcel Liebman died in 1986 and John Saville retired from the editor position in 1990, Miliband and Panitch served as co-editors until 1994. When Miliband died that year the mantle of editorship passed to Panitch. In a tribute to Miliband and the history of the *Register* in the next volume, Panitch (1995, 1) recalled and reaffirmed the original vision for the annual, which was its devotion "to demonstrating the necessity for retaining and articulating a vision of an authentically democratic socialist order; and to addressing the possibility for advances towards it through building new socialist movements alternative to both Communism and Social Democracy, with a repertoire of socialist practice encumbered neither by Leninism nor Labourism" (cf. Davis 2022). Panitch took up the mantle at first with guest

editors and from 1996 onwards with a new editorial collective composed of groups in Toronto and London and corresponding editors spread across the globe. Colin Leys became a co-editor from 1998 to 2010, when he stepped down and was succeeded by Greg Albo and Vivek Chibber. Chibber resigned from the post in 2014, leaving Panitch and Albo as the co-editors, with the 2022 volume being the last with Panitch as co-editor.

Thematically, the *Socialist Register* has covered a wide range of topics since its inception spanning politics, economics, and culture but has devoted particular attention to certain recurring themes: the analysis of changes in the capitalist economy and state; the history and transformation of the working class; socialist strategy and the limits of social democratic and Communist parties in various countries; emergent socialist movements; the critique of Western imperialism; and theoretical developments in Marxism, feminism, and environmentalism.

Politically, the exploration of these recurring themes always brought to the forefront questions of left strategy and socialist organization, taking up the challenge first posed on the British New Left by E.P. Thompson but carried forward in the pages of the *Register* by the likes of André Gorz, Lucio Magri, Miliband, Panitch – one of trying "to rethink the reform/revolution dichotomy ... effectively arguing that cumulative reforms could acquire a radicalizing and mobilizing potential that could have transformative implications" (Davis 2014, 290; cf. Albo, Panitch, and Zuege 2018).

Contributors

Over the years, contributors to the *Socialist Register* have been specialists in various fields of university research, but also journalists, politicians, trade unionists, and social movement activists. Past contributors include Noam Chomsky, Isaac Deutscher, Terry Eagleton, Nancy Fraser, David Harvey, E.J. Hobsbawm, Georg Lukács, Ernest Mandel, Sheila Rowbotham, Jean-Paul Sartre, E.P. Thompson, Hilary Wainwright, Raymond Williams, Ellen Meiksins Wood, Slavoj Žižek, Lucio Magri, Samir Amin, Adolph Reed Jr., Aijaz Ahmad, Lin Chun, Wang Hui, Anwar Shaikh, Jayati Ghosh, Ursula Huws, and many others.

Other editions and histories

In addition to the annual English edition, there have been separate *Socialist Register* volumes translated and published in India, Iran, Greece, South Korea, and Turkey, as well as Spanish and Portuguese editions in Latin America. Several *Socialist Register* anthologies have also been published: *The Globalization Decade* (2003); *Paving the Third Way: A Critique of Parliamentary Socialism* (2003); *Class, Party, Revolution* (2018); and *Capitalism, Technology, Labor* (2020).

More on the history of the *Socialist Register* can be found in the essays by Marion Kozak, “How it All Began: A Footnote to History” (1995) and Ralph Miliband, “Thirty Years of The Socialist Register” (1994), in addition to the essays on the intellectual and political milieu out of which the *Register* emerged by Leo Panitch, “Ralph Miliband, Socialist Intellectual, 1924–1994” (1995) and Madeleine Davis, “Rethinking Class: The Lineage of the *Socialist Register*” (2014).

Leo Panitch (1994, 19) was fond of quoting Miliband in his survey of the *Register*’s history, and that of the socialist movement, written shortly before his death. It seems appropriate to close this entry with Miliband’s assessment because it still captures the *Register*’s sensibility:

I have always thought that the *Register* was doing useful socialist work, and its survival for thirty years [now 60], in a period which has not been good for the Left, may be reckoned to be a matter of some satisfaction ... All in all, I think the publication deserves the mention ‘has done well, could do better’; and over the next thirty years it will.

GREG ALBO AND ALAN ZUEGE

References

- Albo, Greg, Leo Panitch, and Alan Zuege, eds. 2018. *Class, Party, Revolution*. Chicago: Haymarket.
- Albo, Greg, Leo Panitch, and Alan Zuege, eds. 2020. *Capitalism, Technology, Labor*. Chicago: Haymarket.
- Coates, David, ed. 2003. *Paving the Third Way: A Critique of Parliamentary Socialism*. London: Merlin.
- Lin, Chun. 1994. *The British New Left*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.
- Davis, Madeleine. 2014. “Rethinking Class: The Lineage of the Socialist Register.” In *Socialist Register 2014: Registering Class*, edited by Leo Panitch, Greg Albo, and Vivek Chibber. 287–304. London: Merlin.
- Davis, Madeleine. 2022. “Leo Panitch on British Labourism and the Prospects for a Labour New Left.” In *Socialist Register 2023: Capital and Politics*, edited by Greg Albo, Nicole Aschoff, and Alfredo Saad-Filho. London: Merlin.
- Kozak, Marion. 1995. “How it All Began: A Footnote to History.” In *Socialist Register 1995: Why Not Capitalism*, edited by Leo Panitch, 264–85. London: Merlin.
- Miliband, Ralph. 1994. “Thirty Years of The Socialist Register.” In *Socialist Register 1994: Between Globalism and Nationalism*, edited by Ralph Miliband and Leo Panitch, 1–19. London: Merlin.
- Newman, Michael. 2002. *Ralph Miliband and the Politics of the New Left*. London: Merlin.
- Panitch, Leo. 1995. “Ralph Miliband, Socialist Intellectual, 1924–1994.” In *Socialist Register 1995: Why Not Capitalism*, edited by Leo Panitch, 1–21. London: Merlin.
- Panitch, Leo, Colin Leys, Alan Zuege, and Martijn Konings, eds. 2004. *The Globalization Decade*. London and Halifax: Merlin Press and Fernwood Books.

See also

- C. Wright Mills; Ralph Miliband; Leo Panitch; Historical Marxism; Institutional Marxism

59. *Socialist revolution/ review*

The *Socialist Review* was a left-wing scholarly journal in existence from 1970 to 2006. During this time, the journal existed under several names: first as *Socialist Revolution* from 1970–78, then as *Socialist Review* from 1978–2001. The publication was once again renamed in 2002 as *Radical Society*, which officially ceased publication in 2006. Throughout its decades-long history, the publication was a quarterly political and cultural journal which produced Leftist, socialist, and revolutionary perspectives on contemporary political and cultural issues. In addition to conversations about Marxism, socialism, communism, and capitalism, the journal also published articles on the labor movement, feminism, civil rights, culture, and the environment.

A key founder of *Socialist Revolution* was James Weinstein (1926–2005). Originally a member of the Communist Party of the United States, Weinstein eventually left the party in 1956 in objection to the Soviet Union's intervention in Hungary that year. In 1976, Weinstein founded *In These Times*, a monthly progressive magazine covering a wide range of topics and stories. After leaving the CPUSA in 1956, Weinstein still identified as a socialist, but he gravitated toward a position best described as social democracy or democratic socialism, and he remained critical of the Soviet Union and the Marxist Left for the rest of his life.

Weinstein's ideological position was reflected in the journal as *Socialist Revolution* was highly critical of the sectarian Marxist left, the CPUSA, and Communism generally, which the journal criticized as “undemocratic” in organization and goals. The journal was renamed the *Socialist Review* in 1978 to coincide with its shift towards a more social democratic perspective. In its incarnation as

the *Socialist Review*, the journal was closely associated with prominent members of the Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee (DSOC) and the New American Movement (NAM), which merged in 1983 to form the Democratic Socialists of America (DSA). The renamed journal advocated for working within the Democratic Party, a fundamental DSA position, and for pursuing electoral routes to political power for the Left in the United States. In 2002, the journal's name was changed to *Radical Society*, and from 2002 to 2003, it was published by Routledge. By the end of 2006, the journal formally ceased publication.

An archive of the *Socialist Review* can be found at the Paley Library of Temple University. This archive includes editorial correspondence, records, and manuscripts, and is housed in the Contemporary Culture Collection of the library. The 29th volume (2002) and 30th volume (2003) of *Radical Society* can be found at Taylor and Francis Online.

MICHAEL SCIPIONI

References

- “Guide to Social Revolution and Socialist Review Periodicals TAM 659.” Accessed January 23, 2023. http://dlib.nyu.edu/findingaids/html/tamwag/tam_659/bioghist.html.
- Sullivan, Patricia. “Progressive Publisher James Weinstein Dies at 78.” *Washington Post*, June 19, 2005. Accessed January 23, 2023. www.washingtonpost.com/archive/local/2005/06/19/progressive-publisher-james-weinstein-dies-at-78/39c2ae87-6d7d-4cdf-a7ff-06349978d36a/.
- Taylor & Francis. “Radical Society: Review of Culture and Politics List of Issues.” Accessed January 23, 2023. www.tandfonline.com/loi/rras20.
- “Temple University Libraries | Socialist Review Records.” Accessed January 23, 2023. https://library.temple.edu/finding_aids/socialist-review-records.

60. *Strategies: A Journal of Theory, Culture, and Politics*

Strategies: A Journal of Theory, Culture, and Politics (1988–2003) was an interdisciplinary journal that took seriously the importance of the growing interconnections inside and outside academia between theory, politics, and culture. Drawing upon a variety of differing perspectives from within the Western Marxist tradition (e.g., the Frankfurt School, Gramscian Marxism, and autonomist Marxism), and from the diverse theoretical positions usually associated with “postmodernism” or “poststructuralism” (e.g., the work of Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Gilles Deleuze, and Jean Baudrillard), *Strategies* was able to gain an important foothold in the journal ecology during its 15 years of existence. Thus, the journal represented a broad and vibrant “Post-Marxist” orientation that was flourishing at the time. The journal explored—via the analysis of a variety of cultural and political practices—the importance of reflecting on the conditions of exploitation and oppression within capitalist society, and the fundamental necessity of transforming our social world toward deeper forms of equality, liberty, and democracy. In this respect, it represented the overall goals of critical theory, and, thus, by extension, the imperatives of critical political science, regardless of which tradition or intellectual stream one wished to express and/or articulate (Macdonald 2015).

Strategies originally developed out of an independent and interdisciplinary reading workshop of graduate students at UCLA (“Critical Studies Group”), but quickly developed into one of the most cutting-edge theory journals during this period. The original Editorial Collective—which included Philip Armstrong (Art History), Kelly Dennis (Art History), Sandra Halperin (Political Science), Bradley J. Macdonald (Political Science), Lyle Massey (Art History), R. L. Rutsky (Film Studies), Keith Topper (Political Science), Jim Wiltgen (History), and Michael Wintroub (History)—represented a variety of different approaches and interests, but were all committed to exploring the way in which theory linked to politics and culture demanded a form of theorizing that could

articulate its social and political physiognomy in interesting and novel ways.

The inaugural issue of *Strategies*, “Beyond the Modern . . .,” was published in 1988 and served as a rallying cry for taking seriously the post-Marxist trajectory. It would set the tone for future issues of the journal. Issue No. 1 included one of Ernesto Laclau’s earliest interviews on his recently articulated post-Marxist position (Laclau 1988, 10–28), and it was subsequently republished in multiple outlets (Laclau 1990; Rutsky and Macdonald 2003). In this interview, Laclau would clarify ideas developed with Chantal Mouffe in *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy* (1985) and amplify how he saw his relationship to the Marxist tradition in general. For Laclau, a living tradition is one that establishes continuities and discontinuities with the original inaugurators (i.e., Marx and Engels), and Laclau saw his own work as part of the living tradition of Marxism. In response to the continual riposte from the Left that Laclau had become an apostate of Marxism, Laclau noted how he viewed the relation of his theory to this rich and necessary tradition of thought and politics:

We believe that, by clearly locating ourselves in a post-Marxist terrain, we not only help to clarify the meaning of contemporary social struggles but also give to Marxism its theoretical dignity, which can only proceed from recognition of its limitations and of its historicity. Only through such recognition will Marx’s work remain present in our tradition and our political culture. (Laclau and Mouffe 1987, 106)

Subsequent issues continued to pursue developments within the post-Marxist trajectory, while also engaging issues in educational theory and pedagogy, urban theory and cityscapes, critical historiographies, the politics of popular culture, eco-theory, and the political theory of Antonio Negri, among other topics. Most notably, the journal published articles and essays by newly emerging scholars, and more established and internationally renowned scholars such as Henry Kariel (1988), Michael Shapiro (1988), Clyde Barrow (1989), Michael Apple (1989), Edward Soja (1990), Martin Jay (1991), William Connolly (1991), Susan Buck-Morss (1991), Slavoj Žižek (1991), Henry Giroux

(1993), Jane Bennett (2000), and Eugene Holland (2002).

BRADLEY J. MACDONALD

References

- Apple, Michael. 1989. "Why the Right is Winning: Education and the Politics of Common-Sense." *Strategies: A Journal of Theory, Culture, and Politics* No. 2: 24–44.
- Barrow, Clyde. 1989. "Pedagogy, Politics, and Social Reform: The Philosophy of the Workers' Educational Movement." *Strategies: A Journal of Theory, Culture, and Politics* No. 2: 45–66.
- Bennett, Jane. 2000. "De Rerum Natura." *Strategies: A Journal of Theory, Culture, and Politics* Vol. 13, No. 1: 9–22.
- Buck-Morss, Susan. 1991. "US/USSR: Is There a Common Postmodern Culture?" *Strategies: A Journal of Theory, Culture, and Politics* No. 6: 17–49.
- Connolly, William. 1991. "The Agonism of Difference." *Strategies: A Journal of Theory, Culture, and Politics* No. 4/5: 59–68.
- Giroux, Henry. 1993. "Poststructuralist Ruptures and Pedagogical Possibilities: The Turn Towards Theory." *Strategies: A Journal of Theory, Culture, and Politics* No. 7: 10–30.
- Holland, Eugene. 2002. "On Some Implications of Schizoanalysis." *Strategies: A Journal of Theory, Culture, and Politics* Vol. 15, No. 1: 27–42.
- Jay, Martin. 1991. "The Textual Approach to Intellectual History." *Strategies: A Journal of Theory, Culture, and Politics* No. 4/5: 7–18.
- Kariel, Henry. 1988. "Postmodernism at the End." *Strategies: A Journal of Theory, Culture, and Politics* No. 1: 50–63.
- Laclau, Ernesto. 1988. "Building a New Left." *Strategies: A Journal of Theory, Culture, and Politics* No. 1: 10–28.
- Laclau, Ernesto. 1990. *New Reflections on the Revolution of Our Time*. London: Verso Press.
- Laclau, Ernesto and Chantal Mouffe. 1985. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.
- Laclau, Ernesto and Chantal Mouffe. 1987. "Post-Marxism without Apologies." *New Left Review* No. 166: 40–82.
- Macdonald, Bradley J. 2015. "Critical Theory." In *Encyclopedia of Political Thought*, edited by Michael Gibbons, 782–9. New York: Blackwell-Wiley.
- Rutsky, R. L. and Bradley J. Macdonald, eds. 2003. *Strategies for Theory: From Marx to Madonna*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Shapiro, Michael. 1988. "The Politics of Fear: Don DeLillo's Postmodern Burrow." *Strategies: A Journal of Theory, Culture, and Politics* No. 1: 120–42.
- Soja, Edward. 1990. "Heterotopologies: A Remembrance of Other Spaces in Citadel-LA." *Strategies: A Journal of Theory, Culture, and Politics* No. 3: 6–39.
- Zizek, Slavoj. 1991. "The 'Missing Link' of Ideology." *Strategies: A Journal of Theory, Culture, and Politics* No. 6: 93–121.

61. *Studies in Political Economy: A Socialist Review*

Studies in Political Economy: A Socialist Review [SPE] grew out of the renaissance of critical political economy in Canada in the early 1970s. SPE combined insights from the materialist political economy associated with Harold Innis and his staples theory of resource-centered development, the smaller Marxist tradition established by C.B. Macpherson and Stanley Ryerson, and the renewal of Marxist theory taking place in Europe. A “New Canadian Political Economy” (NCPE) was able to establish its own space (the political economy section) within the Canadian Political Science Association. Evidence of the growing interest in NCPE, reflected in the publication of several books including two widely read collections, *Capitalism and the National Question in Canada* (Teeple 1972) and *The Canadian State: Political Economy and Political Power* (Panitch 1977), led to the foundation of the journal in 1979.

In the first issue, political economy was defined as an intellectual tradition that is an “evolving interdisciplinary blend of the history of economic, political and cultural relations.” At the same time, it proudly proclaimed its broadly socialist orientation: “to us as socialists, political economy refers to a tradition of inquiry which, while not Marxist in origin nor exclusively Marxist today, is now being integrated with the theoretical tradition of historical materialism” (Editors 1979, vi). The editorial statement went on to note that “SPE will naturally focus strongly on Canadian questions” but would also publish work done by Canadians and others on important theoretical debates and developments in other parts of the world, especially the Global South.

Reflecting its socialist aspirations, SPE functions as a collective. Policies are set at meetings of the Editorial Board that includes scholars from across the country working in several different disciplines, including political science, economics, sociology, and geography. The Executive – those living in the city of Ottawa, where the journal is published – oversees the review and production processes. The journal also has an open review

process with the names of authors visible to reviewers and vice versa. This, together with the circulation of reviews (one internal and one external) to the Editorial Board, leads to a fairer and more comradely review process.

The initial issues of the journal focused on its core mandate. Like critical political science elsewhere, these featured articles that sought to problematize the capitalist nature of the economy, and identify social class rather than a plurality of interest groups as fundamental to relations of power and conflict. Others pointed to the state, rather than the then-dominant “political system” as an important concept (Mahon 1979; Offe 1980; Leys 1980; Panitch 1981; Jessop 1993). Several of these articles featured prominently in graduate courses across the social sciences.

Another strand of work on class focused on the nature of the dominant class in Canada (cf Carroll 1982) and in Quebec (Bourque 1979), and its association with Canada’s continued dependence on staples-exports, uneven regional development, and the development of a branch plant economy. These issues were highlighted in a special issue on “Rethinking Canadian Political Economy” (Issue 6) and developed in subsequent issues. Unlike mainstream political science, moreover, from the outset SPE was interested in articles exploring changes in the labor process, the labor movement, and the working class more broadly (e.g. Hyman 1979; Marchak 1979) and continues to do so (cf Bryan 2019; Tucker 2020; Thomas 2020). A third strand addressed questions of strategy and struggles for social change (Therborn 1984; Ross and Jenson 1983).

Debates about the state and classes constituted the initial focus, but it was not long before a series of openings occurred, and the incorporation of socialist feminist concerns was the first of these concerns introduced into the journal. The journal’s predominantly male founding editors had been sensitive to the need to reflect the work of socialist feminists although how to address this was subject to some debate. In 1983 the journal published two articles including Pat and Hugh Armstrong’s widely noted “Beyond Sexless Class and Classless Sex: Towards Marxist Feminism.” In the following years socialist feminist research and debates on theoretical questions with important contributions by MacDonald (1984) and Jenson (1986) appeared regularly,

a trend highlighted in a special issue on “Feminism and Political Economy” in 1989. This development was accompanied by a significant shift in the make-up of the Editorial Board. Within five years, women constituted one-third of the editorial board and rough parity was reached by the end of the journal’s first decade. Reflecting these changes, an updated statement of editorial policy in Issue 34 (Spring 1991) defined the journal more broadly as a forum for “people who identify with the struggles to overcome exploitation, exclusion and oppression in Canada and abroad” (inside front cover).

SPE first addressed the issue of race/ racialization as an element of political economy in 1983 with the publication of Ron Bourgeault’s “The Indian, the Métis and the Fur Trade” (1983) and then more broadly with a special issue on the intersectionality of race, class, and gender, edited by Creese and Stasiulis (1996). Nonetheless, apart from an interview with Kahn-Tineta Horn (1991), until recently the journal largely ignored settler colonialism’s past and present oppression of Indigenous Peoples and the latter’s resistances thereto.

As the original editorial statement foresaw, the journal’s understanding of political economy has continued to evolve over time. Although the state has remained an important topic, the rise of neoliberal globalization inspired a new set of debates. One of these concerned the changing boundary between the state and economy; in particular the trend to privatization and marketization of the state (Whiteside 2017). These issues were the focus of a symposium that included an exploration of the contradictions of private union pension plans (Skerrett 2019). Another debate centered around the nation state: has globalization undermined the nation-state or has the state, especially the American state, been an important agent of imperialism and global capitalism (see, Hirsch and Wissel 2011; Editors 2014; Barrow and Keck 2017)? In addition, the appearance of articles on developments in other parts of the world has increased along with the deepening of globalization. While the interest in Europe has not disappeared (Pouche and Trouve 2018, Kipfer 2019), developments in the Global South have drawn increased attention (Hanieh 2009, Levy 2013; Saad Filho 2014; Garcia 2017).

Nancy Fraser’s charge that feminism has been co-opted by neoliberalism provoked a sharp response by Canadian feminist political economists (Vosko 2002). In Issue 94, SPE published Meg Luxton’s (2014) contention that such arguments ignore or misrepresent the work of Marxist feminists which was a vital part of the feminist movement in general, and particularly in Canada. Luxton’s article sparked a lively debate in the same volume which inter alia criticized Canadian Marxist feminists for ignoring important work by feminists of color.

While interest in staples theory diminished in the 1990s, it has been revived with the growth of critical interest in extractivism and the role of Canadian mining transnational corporations at home and abroad. This new work has merged with the already growing interest in the cross-fertilization of political ecology/political economy heralded by the publication of a special issue on political ecology and Canadian political economy (Dalby and Keil 2003). Recent articles have also made the links between the extractive economy, the state and Indigenous Peoples (e.g., McCreary and Turner 2018).

For most of its 42 years, SPE has been a forum for scholars who “identify with the struggles to overcome exploitation, exclusion and oppression.” The scope of its project of critical political economy has been to publish research that not only describes these processes and illuminates the forces and relationships bringing them into being, but also provides insightful analysis of the struggles to overcome them. The former has been much easier to accomplish than the latter. The creation of the Alternatives section of the journal in 2010 was intended to address this imbalance but with mixed success, in part a reflection of the waning of popular struggles.

RIANNE MAHON AND DONALD SWARTZ

References

- Armstrong, Pat and Hugh Armstrong. 1983. “Beyond Sexless Class and Classless Sex: Towards Feminist Marxism.” *Studies in Political Economy* 10, no. 1: 7–44.
- Armstrong, Pat and Pat Connelly eds. 1989. “Feminist Political Economy: An Introduction.” *Studies in Political Economy* 30, no. 1: 5–12.

- Barrow, Clyde and Michelle Keck. 2017. "Globalization Theory and State Theory: The False Antinomy." *Studies in Political Economy* 98, no. 2: 177–96.
- Bourque, Gilles. 1979. "Class, Nation and the Parti Quebecois." *Studies in Political Economy* 2, no. 1: 129–58.
- Bryan, Catherine. 2019. "Labour, Population and Precarity: Temporary Foreign Workers' Transition to Permanent Residency in Rural Manitoba." *Studies in Political Economy* 100, no. 3: 252–69.
- Carroll, William K. 1982. "The Canadian Corporate Elite: Financiers or Finance Capitalists." *Studies in Political Economy* 8, no. 1: 89–114.
- Creese, Gillian and Daiva Stasiulis eds. 1996. "Intersections of Gender, Race, Class and Sexuality." *Studies in Political Economy* (Special Issue) 51, no. 1: 5–217.
- Dalby, Simon and Roger Keil eds. 2003. "Political Ecology and Canadian Political Economy." *Studies in Political Economy* (Special Issue) 70, no. 1: 5–172.
- Editors. 1981. "Editorial Notes." *Studies in Political Economy* 6, no. 1: 2–5.
- Editors/2014. "Introduction to Forum: American Empire or Global Capitalism?" *Studies in Political Economy* 93, no. 1: 153–74.
- Garcia, Ana. 2017. "BRIC'S Investment Agreements in Africa: More of the Same?" *Studies in Political Economy* 98, no. 1: 24–47.
- Hanieh, Adam. 2009. "Hierarchies of a Global Market: The South and Economic Crisis." *Studies in Political Economy* 83, no. 1: 61–84.
- Hirsch, Joachim and Jens Wissel. 2011. "The Transformation of Contemporary Capitalism and the Concept of a Transnational Capitalist Class: A Critical Review in Neo-Poulantzian Perspective." *Studies in Political Economy* 88, no. 1: 7–33.
- Horn, Kahn Tineta. 1991. "Beyond Oka: Dimensions of Mohawk Sovereignty." *Studies in Political Economy* 35, no. 1: 29–41.
- Hyman, Richard. 1979. "British Trade Unionism in the 70s." *Studies in Political Economy* 1, no. 1: 93–112.
- Jenson, Jane. 1986. "Gender and Reproduction or, Babies and the State." *Studies in Political Economy* 20, no. 1: 9–46.
- Jessop, Bob. 1993. "Towards a Schumpeterian Workfare State? Preliminary Remarks on Post-Fordist Political Economy." *Studies in Political Economy* 40, no. 1: 7–39.
- Kipfer, Stefan. 2019. "What Colour is Your Vest? Reflections on the Yellow Vest Movement in France." *Studies in Political Economy* 100, no. 3: 209–31.
- Levy, Charmaine. 2013. "Working Towards 'Tekojojd': The Political Struggles of the Paraguayan Left." *Studies in Political Economy* 92, no. 1: 29–56.
- Leys, Colin. 1980. "Neo-Conservatism and the Organic Crisis in Britain." *Studies in Political Economy* 4, no. 1: 41–64.
- Luxton, Meg. 2014. "Marxist Feminism and Anticapitalism: Reclaiming our History, Reanimating Our Past." *Studies in Political Economy* 94, no. 1: 137–60.
- MacDonald, Martha. 1984. "Economics and Feminism: The Dismal Science." *Studies in Political Economy* 15, no. 1: 151–78.
- Mahon, Rianne. 1979. "Regulatory Agencies: Captive Agents or Hegemonic Apparatuses?" *Studies in Political Economy* 1, no. 1: 162–200.
- Marchak, Patricia. 1979. "Labour in a Staples Economy." *Studies in Political Economy* 2, no. 1: 7–35.
- McCreary, Tyler and Jerome Turner. 2018. "The Contested Scales of Indigenous Settler Jurisdiction: Unist'ot'en Struggles with Canadian Pipeline Governance." *Studies in Political Economy* 99, no. 3: 223–45.
- Offe, Claus. 1980. "The Separation of Form and Content in Liberal Democratic Politics." *Studies in Political Economy* 3, no. 1: 5–16.
- Panitch, Leo. 1981. "Dependency and Class in Canadian Political Economy." *Studies in Political Economy* 6, no. 1: 7–34.
- Panitch, Leo, ed. 1977. *The Canadian State: Political Economy and Political Power*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Pouche, Thierry and Aurélie Trouvé. 2018. "Deregulation and the Crisis of Dairy Markets In Europe: Facts for Economic Interpretation." *Studies in Political Economy* 99, no. 1: 194–212.
- Ross, George and Jane Jenson. 1983. "Crisis and France's 'Third Way'." *Studies in Political Economy* 11, no. 1: 71–104.
- Saad Filho, Alfredo. 2014. "Brazil: Development Strategies and Social Change from Import Substitution to the 'Events of June'." *Studies in Political Economy* 94, no. 1: 3–29.
- Skerrett, Kevin. 2018. "Pension Funds, Privatization and the Limits to 'Workers Capital'." *Studies in Political Economy* 99, no. 1: 20–41.
- Teeple, Gary, ed. 1972. *Capitalism and the National Question in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Therborn, Göran. 1984. "Classes and States: Welfare State Developments, 1881–1981." *Studies in Political Economy* 14, no. 1: 7–41.
- Thomas, Mark. 2020. "For the People? Regulating employment standards in an era of Right-Wing Populism." *Studies in Political Economy* 101, no. 2: 135–54.

- Tucker, Eric. 2020. "Towards a Political Economy of Platform-Mediated Work." *Studies in Political Economy* 101, no. 3: 185–207.
- Vosko, Leah. 2002. "The Past and Futures of Feminist Political Economy in Canada: Reviving the Debate." *Studies in Political Economy* 68, no. 1: 55–83.
- Whiteside, Heather. 2017. "The Canada Infrastructure Bank: Private Finance as Poor Alternative." *Studies in Political Economy* 98, no. 2: 223–37.

PART III

CONCEPTS

62. Academic repression

Academic repression is the use of intimidation, harassment, penalties, and termination to deny the right of professors and students to hold unorthodox, nonconformist, critical, controversial, and dissenting views to conduct research, publish, teach, speak, and engage politically as they choose (Nocella II et al. 2010, 27). The concept of academic repression has gained prominence in critical university studies as a way to challenge mainstream histories of the American university, which present conflicts between university intellectuals, corporate boards of trustees, and state elites as a history of the development of academic freedom in the United States (Hofstadter and Metzger 1955).

The modern problem of academic repression surfaced in the 1890s as rising labor and political radicalism made university boards of trustees, which consisted mainly of corporate executives, to grow increasingly concerned about the ideological and political impact of the social sciences and humanities. Business trustees considered university faculty to be employees-at-will, who should follow orders from “management,” and who could be terminated without cause if they failed to obey an employer. On the other hand, new PhDs who had been trained in Germany returned to the United States with the belief that academic freedom and academic tenure were fundamental rights and prerogatives of university professors (Barrow 1990, Chaps. 2, 7–8). This initial clash between the corporate ideal and the academic ideal of the American university resulted in the dismissal or resignation of many prominent economists, sociologists, and political scientists during the 1890s and early 1900s.

In fact, all of the early “academic freedom” cases exemplified the failure of faculty to secure academic freedom and the successful use of academic repression by corporate executives and state elites to terminate faculty who espoused pro-labor, Populist, socialist, communist, feminist, atheistic, or other radical views. Waves of academic repression have continued to sweep across American universities during periods of social upheaval (1930s, 1960s), as well as periods of political reaction (1920s, 1950s, 1980s) (Sinclair 1923; Schrecker 1986). Antony Nocella II and others (2010) have collected case studies

from the 1970s to the present, which suggest that academic repression may be worse today than at any time in the last hundred years with many of these cases involving prominent figures in the critical political science and radical political economics movements.

Corporate trustees, university administrators, and state elites have developed an extensive array of interrelated mechanisms that are now used for academic repression. First, corporate-funded right-wing think tanks and rogue anti-intellectuals now routinely monitor university faculty looking for what they consider morally objectionable or “un-American” ideas in the curriculum (Sykes 1988; Horowitz 2017). A second mechanism are “campus watch” groups that monitor and report any perceived deviations from conservative orthodoxy. These two mechanisms are often linked to letter writing campaigns designed to influence trustees and administrators, ignite media smear campaigns, and mass email assaults to embarrass, intimidate, and isolate faculty who question conservative doctrines. These campaigns aim to demonize faculty, discredit entire fields of study, and generate an atmosphere of fear among faculty. Clyde W. Barrow (1990, 2014) has described these campaigns as “terrorism without violence,” because they isolate targeted faculty by generating a chilling effect on colleagues who are afraid of guilt-by-association.

Third, the structural transformation of academic labor intensifies the chilling effect of academic repression. Academic tenure has been considered a bedrock of academic freedom, but the academic labor force has been casualized over many decades. Three-quarters of the faculty teaching in American universities are working without tenure protections. This de-tenuring of the professoriate endangers the foundations of the modern university by institutionalizing “structural repression” as a basic configuration of the twenty-first-century university, where dependency and insecurity are the cornerstones of acquiescence and compliance.

Fourth, the expansion and arming of campus police forces and their use by administrators as a repressive apparatus has been a prominent feature of university development for several decades (Nocella II and Gabbard 2013). Three-quarters of four-year colleges and universities with 2,500 or more students in the United States are served by

a campus police department with sworn officers who have full arrest powers. Campus police are increasingly required to conduct criminal background checks of prospective employees, including faculty, which inserts them into the faculty search and screen process. Campus police monitor expansive camera surveillance systems, while increasing their use of more intrusive campus policing and patrols. Campus police departments have completed the transition from unarmed security services responsible for building access, parking enforcement, and key control to well-armed professional police departments with detective, surveillance, and even para-military units.

Finally, universities are coming to mirror the signature features of what Michel Foucault calls the surveillance society. One can observe a general criminalization of dissent and activism on campuses through the use of free speech zones, suspensions, and expulsions. This trend was manifest in how university administrators and campus police responded to the Occupy Movement on campuses. A growing concern is that ever increasing academic repression will make it difficult for new generations of faculty and students to develop the autonomy required to build effective protest movements and achieve progressive social change.

CLYDE W. BARROW

References

- Barrow, Clyde W. 1990. *Universities and the Capitalist State: Corporate Liberalism and the Reconstruction of American Higher Education, 1894–1928*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Hofstadter, Richard and Walter Metzger. 1955. *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Horowitz, David. 2017. *The Black Book of the American Left Volume 8: The Left in the University*. Washington, DC: Regnery.
- Nocella II, Anthony J., Steven Best, and Peter McLaren. 2010. *Academic Repression: Reflections from the Academic Industrial Complex*. Oakland, CA: AK Press, 2010.
- Nocella II, Anthony J. and David Gabbard. 2013. *Policing the Campus: Academic Repression, Surveillance, and the Occupy Movement*, New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Schrecker, Ellen. 1986. *No Ivory Tower: McCarthyism and the Universities*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, Upton. 1923. *The Goose-Step: A Study of American Higher Education*, Revised edition. Pasadena: Privately Printed.
- Sykes, Charles J. 1988. *ProfScam: Professors and the Demise of Higher Education*. Washington, DC: Regnery.

See also

Michael Parenti; Carl Boggs; Critical University Studies; Disciplinary History

63. Alienation

Karl Marx is not the first thinker to have treated the concept of alienation as a term of art, but in the context of critical political science, it is Marx's account that requires consideration. There are two issues to be addressed in this entry. The first issue is definitional. What did Marx mean by the term "alienation"? What is it to be alienated? The second issue is the matter of how, exactly, alienation figures within capitalism. These two issues map onto two of Marx's works in particular: *The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* and *Capital*, respectively.

Alienation as estrangement

We can get a handle on what Marx means by the term alienation by beginning with the word itself. In English, the root noun "alien" tells us that something is foreign, "not-us" (even if this may not be the case ultimately). The verb, meanwhile – "to alienate" – means to render something "other" that may not have been so originally (or may not be so ultimately). This "rendering other" may be quite mundane: if I sell or hand over something that I made or own, for instance, I thereby alienate it in this traditional sense of the verb. That which I have alienated by selling or handing it over is now "other" to me. If we want to be precise about it, as Marx does in the *1844 Manuscripts*, we can be careful to distinguish between alienation and objectification. One might think – especially if one were in a Hegelian or perhaps even Aristotelian frame of mind – that the mere act of making something, of externalizing one's subjectivity into an object, counts as a "rendering other" of one's consciousness, such that we are automatically alienated from ourselves in the act of shaping nature. I will note simply that Marx explicitly rejects this supposition.

What is it, then, that becomes alien to us when we are alienated? In the *1844 Manuscripts*, Marx identifies four main things (or kinds of thing) that are "rendered other" in the requisite sense: (1) our own productive activity; (2) the products of our labor (but again, not simply because they are objectifications); (3) other people; and, at the deepest level, (4) what he calls our "species being," our essentially human capacities.

(Note: I have rearranged Marx's order of presentation of these categories.) Alienation from "species being" is the core phenomenon, though it is related to the other three facets of alienation.

By "species being," Marx means those qualities that are essential to us as human beings. As Aristotle put it, what is essential to us – and by extension to our well-being – is our capacity for two different kinds of activity: investigation of the form of those things that have a form, and wise deliberation about particular, concrete circumstances. The ability to shape nature, he did not consider to be the stuff of human flourishing. Marx blurs the Aristotelian lines. "Free, conscious activity," he writes, "is man's species character" (Marx 1964, 113). Our ability to collectively transform both nature and ourselves (we being a part of nature) as we see fit, potentially (though not necessarily) self-consciously, potentially (though not necessarily) for the better, that is what distinguishes us as human beings. "Admittedly," Marx (1964, 113) writes, "animals also produce" but he continues, echoing Rousseau, "an animal produces ... only under the dominion of immediate physical need"; whereas a human being, by contrast, "produces even when he is free from physical need and only truly produces in freedom therefrom." Crucially, human beings, being able to "apply everywhere the inherent standard to the object ... are uniquely able to [form] things in accordance with the laws of beauty" (Marx 1964, 114). It is this species-defining capacity for free, conscious activity – activity conceived as art – from which we are alienated at the deepest level, when we are alienated. We are cut off from it to the extent that we are not able to freely, intentionally, and in concert with others make a world for ourselves.

As Marx uses the term, the concept of alienation captures the idea that what has been rendered alien to us is our own agency. Moreover, in conditions of alienation our own agency comes to act back upon us, in ways that escape our immediate control. In thinking along these lines Marx is echoing Feuerbach, who had argued that God is simply our own subjectivity projected onto an imaginary being whom we then believe to be all-powerful. However, in the case that interests Marx (viz., that of what he called in 1844 'estranged labor'), the power of the

social relations in question is decidedly real, not (as he believed of deities) imaginary.

Already in the 1844 *Manuscripts*, Marx recognized that alienation was part and parcel of living in a society based on a certain kind of production. Still, Marx's political economy was thin at this point. What is communicated so effectively in 1844 is what the stakes are: the depth and degree of dehumanization that alienation involves in capitalist society. It is not until *Capital* that we get a full-blown account of the mode of production to which alienation is integral.

Alienation as the value-form

In *Capital*, Marx offers an exhaustive critique of the dynamics that he had only begun to conceptualize in 1844. I cannot begin to summarize the complexity of the analysis in so short a space, but the key points with respect to alienation are as follows.

In capitalism, unlike in any other kind of class society, owners of the means of production purchase the labor power of workers for the sole end of using it to generate profit (which objective they achieve by paying workers a wage that is not equal in value to the value of the commodities that workers produce in exchange for it). Marx calls labor used for this purpose "abstract labor." Abstract labor is abstract conceptually, in that it is labor considered generically, as nothing other than an expenditure of energy, but it is generic concretely, too, in that it is labor that all has the same function: namely, to inject unpaid-for and thus "surplus" value into what Marx calls the valorization process. Labor of this type produces objects that are generic too. From the perspective of the owner of the means of production, commodities are simply repositories of value, waiting to be turned back into money by being sold.

Production of this kind is marked by alienation through and through. To go back to the categories of the 1844 *Manuscripts*, workers and owners alike are alienated from (1) the process of labor in that both are engaged in production that is nothing other than the self-valorization of value: production for the purpose of profit accumulation. Production of this kind is a far cry from the exercise of our capacity to shape nature in accordance with the laws of beauty. Workers are especially alienated in this regard. Not only are they compelled to work, it is their efficacy

that is commodified, turned into a quantity of abstract labor – or, as Marx later calls it, "variable capital." Workers and owners alike are also, in such conditions, alienated from (2) the objects of labor. Capitalist commodities are produced and exchanged as widgets, as mere quantities of value. Moreover, even once they drop out of circulation, and come to be used by someone, they remain objectifications, to use the Hegelian locution, not of workers' creative human capacities, but of labor power that is itself alienated. And here too it is workers who are especially alienated, in that they may well not be able to own or enjoy the objects of their own (alienated) labor.

Workers and owners alike are also alienated from (3) other people, both as members of classes and as individuals within their own class. Above all, workers are exploited by owners in that they are not paid a wage that is equal in value to the value of what they produce. But workers and owners alike, albeit in different ways, are led to compete with members of their own class, too. And in capitalism neither workers nor owners get to take part in collective deliberation about how best to use our total productive capacity to meet our needs. Finally, capitalism as a system amounts to alienation from (4) species-being precisely insofar as it alienates us in the ways that I have just described. Our capacity to self-consciously shape both nature and ourselves – a capacity for freedom, in fact – is thwarted in capitalism. Rather than being agents able to make our own history, as Marx puts it, we are, all of us, workers and owners alike, subject to the logic of profit accumulation. The tragic irony is that that logic is in fact our own alienated intentionality, having become "other" to us and now threatening our very existence on the planet.

RUTH PORTER GROFF

References

Marx, Karl. 1964. *The Economic & Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. New York: International Publishers.

Further readings

Hegel, G.W.F. 1967. *The Phenomenology of Mind*, translated, with an introduction and notes by J.B. Baillie. New York: Harper & Row. Publishers.

Marx, Karl. 2010. [1867]. "Capital: A Critique

of Political Economy, Volume 1.” In *Marx & Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 35, v-852. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Ollman, Bertell. 1971. *Alienation: Marx's Conception of Man in Capitalist Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

64. Anarchism

Anarchism is in the air these days, whether it is on the street or in the academy, embraced or derided, people are talking about anarchism. It's not always clear, though, what anarchism is or what it implies. This should not be surprising, since many important political terms have long had many meanings, such as democracy, republicanism, liberalism, feminism, and so on. In order to get an initial grip on anarchism requires that we look a bit at its history.

One of the seminal articles on anarchism is the *Encyclopedia Britannica* article on the term penned by the Russian anarchist Peter Kropotkin. Kropotkin (1995, 233) defines anarchism as "the name given to a principle or theory of life and conduct under which society is conceived without government – harmony in such a society being obtained, not by submission to law, or by obedience to any authority, but by free agreements concluded by the various groups." He distinguishes communist anarchism from individualist anarchism, the latter term roughly equivalent to what we would now call "libertarianism." For libertarians, the founding value is liberty; equality of any sort plays little to no role in their thought.

By contrast, communist anarchists are keenly interested in equality. This might seem paradoxical, since liberty itself often leads to various sorts of inequality and Kropotkin's definition stresses free agreement as an alternative to state intervention. However, as George Crowder (1991) has argued, the tension between liberty and equality is not as pronounced in much of nineteenth-century thought as it will become later. For anarchists of that period, humans, if not subject to deleterious power relationships, are capable of conducting themselves in relations of equality with one another through free agreement. So the project is not so much to mold human beings but rather to remove the obstacles, chiefly instantiated in the state and capitalism, from their path.

Although anarchism was a prominent political view in the nineteenth century, over the course of much of the twentieth it went into eclipse. There are various reasons for this, among them the success of Marxism in the Russian revolution and the backlash faced through what was called "propaganda by the

deed," the view that by assassinating political and economic elites an anarchist revolution could be unleashed. Anarchism's revival had much to do with French Situationism, articulated most prominently by Guy Debord in his book *The Society of the Spectacle* (1994), which importantly influenced the events of May 1968 in France, events which helped lead to the demise of Marxism in Europe (because the French Communist Party opposed the events). Since then, and especially since the fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of Soviet Communism, anarchism as an alternative progressive theory has found its way back into discussion.

Although there remains some confusion between anarchism-as-liberty and anarchism-as-equality, especially among many activists who identify as anarchists, anarchism is properly conceived as founded on equality rather than liberty. In particular, it is founded on the supposition that everyone who is not deeply cognitively or emotionally challenged is capable of constructing a life for themselves alongside others, and that social arrangements that reflect that supposition can and should be built from the bottom up – that is, through free agreement among the participants. Moreover, the obstacles to such building are various forms of domination that occur throughout society – including not only the state and capital but also racism, sexism, homophobia, ableism, and so on. Therefore, the anarchist task is, to the extent possible, to build such arrangements while always being aware of the danger of domination in its various manifestations.

Within this project, one can distinguish various kinds of anarchism, from feminist anarchism to eco-anarchism to post-structuralist anarchism, the last of which offers an anarchist interpretation of thinkers like Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze. A broader distinction within anarchism might be that between a more utopian anarchism and a non-utopian anarchism. The former, which is more continuous with nineteenth-century anarchism, envisions and seeks to create an anarchist society, one in which the bonds of domination have been cleared away. The latter is more skeptical of this possibility. As the British anarchist Colin Ward (1988, 26) has put it: "There is no final struggle, only a series of partisan struggles on a variety of fronts."

On the ground, anarchism appears in various guises, some of which are self-consciously anarchist and others of which have been strongly influenced by anarchist trends whether or not they identify as anarchist. For instance, the common phrase “Be the change you want to see” is a deeply anarchist sentiment. It harkens back to nineteenth-century anarchists’ critique of Marxism that predicted that the Marxist project of taking over the state would result, not in a society of equals, but instead simply in a change of roles between dominating and dominated.

Among those who identify with anarchism, there are a variety of groups. Often it is those who are willing – or at times seemingly eager – to commit violence against people or property that are the subject of much focus, such as some who identify as Black Bloc or antifa. However, many anarchists seek to influence progressive movements in the direction of egalitarian social and political

movements, creating horizontal organizations that empower those involved in them.

For the future, it seems as though the egalitarian impulse of anarchism has displaced the more top-down approach of Marxism (or Leninist Marxism) as the organizing principle of the left. Moreover, its spread into feminist, ecological, and other movements seems to assure its continuing influence for some time to come.

TODD MAY

References

- Crowder, George. 1991. *Classical Anarchism: The Political Thought of Godwin, Proudhon, Bakunin, and Kropotkin*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Debord, Guy. 1994 [1967]. *Society of the Spectacle*. New York: Zone Books.
- Kropotkin, Peter [1911]. 1995. “Anarchism.” In *The Conquest of Bread and Other Writings*, edited by Marshall Shatz. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ward, Colin. 1988. *Anarchy in Action*. London: Freedom Press.

65. Antifascism

Antifa is a contraction of antifascism or antifascist, which refers to the countermovement that is organized in opposition to far-right ideologies, movements, and organizations. Antifa activists define fascism as an ideology that is rooted in the belief in a biological and social hierarchy of people which is enforced through violence (Burley 2017; Vysotsky 2020). The antifascist movement strategy relies on the countermovement goals of pre-emption or dissuasion of group mobilization and damage or destruction of the opposing group (Zald and Useem 1987). These goals are achieved through a variety of tactics designed to demobilize street level, populist far-right movements.

The antifascist movement is intentionally broad and diffuse. It is comprised of a decentralized network of individual activists and formal affinity groups described as “a militant, non-hierarchical, geographically dispersed social movement comprised of local autonomous activist groups” that is “also a transnational movement not spatially restricted to the US” (Copsey and Merrill 2020, 125). Participation in antifascist activism operates on a continuum from informal to formal (Vysotsky 2020). Activism that is categorized as informal or “everyday” antifascism typically involves spontaneous actions by individuals or small groups of people in opposition to fascist organizing efforts or activity that they are confronted with during routine activities. Informal activism is typically engaged in by individuals who are ideologically opposed to fascism but are not affiliated with a formal antifascist collective. Formal antifascist groups operate autonomously at the local level; and while some affinity groups may join formal networks, there is neither an official antifa organization nor are all antifa groups working in coordination with one another. An additional category of independent activists consists of individuals who engage in similar activities to formal groups as individuals with variable levels of commitment to or identification as antifascist activists. The committed independent activists and formal groups represent what is generally recognized as antifa activism.

Antifascist activists generally do not subscribe to a specific ideology as “there is no political party affiliation, no central organiza-

tion, no central leadership, and no prescribed doctrine beyond a shared belief that ‘fascism’ must be defeated” (Copsey and Merrill 2020, 125). However, most independent activists and formal groups become involved in antifa activism as an extension of left-wing ideology and activism (Bray 2017; Copsey and Merrill 2020; Vysotsky 2020). This ideological and activist orientation provides antifascists a unique awareness of the threat of far-right violence because fascists directly target them due to their political identity. Whereas most formal antifa groups are majority white, there is substantial representation, if not over-representation, of people of color, people from religious minority communities (especially Jewish and Muslim activists), women, and LGBTQ+ people (Vysotsky 2020). Antifa activism is embedded within a broader left-wing activist milieu with many antifascists also participating in organizations working toward economic, political, and social justice. These networks facilitate coalition building between antifa activists and social justice organizations to generate a mass movement against fascist organizing. Antifa activists are embedded in, and responsible, to broader social movements and the communities within which they operate (Vysotsky 2020).

The antifascist movement deploys a broad tactical repertoire consisting of a range of actions designed to demobilize the fascist movement. Antifascists subscribe to the ideal that fascism must be opposed “by any means necessary,” which “carries a commitment to leave open all available tactics, including, hypothetically, the intensification of violence should the need arise” (Copsey and Merrill 2020, 124). The overwhelming majority of antifa tactics are classified as non-militant and consist of activities that are “within the bounds of what is considered acceptable social movement activity by mainstream political and movement actors” (Vysotsky 2020, 86) such as intelligence and information gathering, education campaigns, public shaming campaigns, and cultural activity. These types of tactics aim to inoculate the public against fascist ideology and deploy the stigma associated with fascist activism and identity to demobilize the movement (Berbrier 1999; Simi and Futrell 2009). Militant tactics that disrupt fascist activity or directly confront fascists, including the use of violence, constitute a relatively small

portion of the antifascist repertoire (Bray 2017; Vysotsky 2020).

Antifa militancy is informed by a practical necessity to defend people and places against distinct threats – physical, political, and spatial – that they experience or perceive from fascists (Vysotsky 2020). Individuals experience an “existential danger” because they are targeted for violence by fascists as a result of their identity (Vysotsky 2020, 134). Fascists pose a political threat because they are a direct ideological threat to left-oriented movements and frequently seek to recruit from a similar base of subcultural and working-class populations (Bray 2017; Vysotsky 2020). The spatial threat is both literal and metaphorical. Due to frequent subcultural affiliations or political activity, anti-fascists and fascists frequent similar spaces, which undermines efforts to construct prefigurative “free spaces” and reinforces the physical threat of fascist violence. Subcultures, more broadly, serve as the metaphorical space for conflict over authenticity and rebellion as a result of fascist activity and antifascist response (Madfis and Vysotsky 2020; Vysotsky 2020). The threats posed by fascists are often directly experienced by antifascists who report receiving verbal intimidation and physical violence (Vysotsky 2013; 2020). Antifa activists, therefore, conceive of militant responses as a form of “self-defense” and community defense from potential or actual fascist violence (Clark 2018; Copsey and Merrill 2020; Vysotsky 2020).

Antifa activism serves as a direct counter-movement to the organizing and mobilization efforts of the far-right. Antifascist activism encompasses a variety of informal, formal, and independent forms of organization that utilizes a broad tactical repertoire to pre-empt or dissuade fascist mobilization and cause damage or destruction to far right movements by “rais[ing] the costs of mobilization” (Zald and Useem 1987, 260). Antifa militancy serves as a form of “self-defense” because of

the direct threats posed by far-right activists and activity.

STANISLAV VYSOTSKY

References

- Berbrier, Mitch. 1999. “Impression Management for the Thinking Racist: A Case Study of Intellectualization as Stigma Transformation in Contemporary White Supremacist Discourse.” *The Sociological Quarterly* 40, no. 3: 411–33.
- Bray, Mark. 2017. *Antifa: The Antifascist Handbook*. Brooklyn, NY: Melville House Publishing.
- Burley, Shane. 2017. *Fascism Today: What It Is and How to End It*. Chico, CA: AK Press.
- Clark, J. 2018. “Three-Way Fight: Revolutionary Anti-Fascism and Armed Self-Defense.” In *Setting Sights: Histories and Reflections on Community Armed Self-Defense*, edited by Scott Crow, 49–67. Oakland, CA: PM Press.
- Copsey, Nigel, and Samuel Merrill. 2020. “Violence and Restraint within Antifa: A View from the United States.” *Perspectives on Terrorism* 14, no. 6: 122–38.
- Madfis, Eric, and Stanislav Vysotsky. 2020. “Exploring Subcultural Trajectories: Racist Skinhead Disengagement, Desistance, and Countercultural Value Persistence.” *Sociological Focus* 53, no. 3: 221–35.
- Simi, Pete, and Robert Futrell. 2009. “Negotiating White Power Activist Stigma.” *Social Problems* 56, no. 1: 89–110.
- Vysotsky, Stanislav. 2013. “The Influence of Threat on Tactical Choices of Militant Anti-Fascist Activists.” *Interface: A Journal for and about Social Movements* 5, no. 2: 263–94.
- Vysotsky, Stanislav. 2020. *American Antifa: The Tactics, Culture, and Practice of Militant Antifascism*. New York: Routledge.
- Zald, Meyer N., and Bert Useem. 1987. “Movement and Countermovement Interaction: Mobilization, Tactics and State Involvement.” In *Social Movements in an Organizational Society: Collected Essays*, edited by Meyer N. Zald and John D. McCarthy, 247–72. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

See also

Anarchism; Community Armed Self-Defense; Direct Action; Diversity of Tactics

66. Capitalist class

Political science entails the systematic analysis of power relations, which means that efforts to interrogate the power of the capitalist class should be at the discipline's center. Yet, as acknowledged by even mainstream luminaries in the discipline: "it is striking how little political scientists actually know about the political attitudes and behavior of wealthy citizens" (Page et al. 2013, 66). A major reason for this lacuna is a common and longstanding disciplinary aversion to Marxism, which has frequently rendered class analysis anathema in mainstream research and journals.

The classic formulation of the capitalist class belongs to Karl Marx and Frederick Engels (1978 [1888], 474), who argued that industrial society was split between "two great hostile camps" – a *bourgeoisie*, or capitalist class, that owns private property (i.e., the means of production), and a *proletariat* that must sell its labor to the capitalist class to survive. Marx (1978 [1867], 362–3) wrote with characteristic flair that: "Capital is dead labour, that, vampire-like, only lives by sucking living labour, and lives the more, the more labour it sucks." Accordingly, the capitalist is not precisely *free*. As neoliberal lode-star Ludwig von Mises argued: "The market controls [the entrepreneur] more strictly and exactingly than could any government or other organ of society" (quoted in Slobodian 2018, 107–08).

For Marx, the capitalist class exists objectively as a "class in itself" through its shared position in the social hierarchy, and subjectively as a "class for itself" whose members are cognizant, and act on the basis, of belonging to this class. As an ascendant capitalist class has risen in both forms – materially and ideationally – around the world, it has achieved a significant degree of hegemony, become mutually imbricated with the state, and "create[d] a world after its own image" – wealthier and more technologically advanced, but also increasingly unequal and crisis-ridden – by "batter[ing] down all Chinese walls" that impede capital's circulation (Marx and Engels 1978 [1888], 477). Before its eventual overthrow (per the conventional Marxist story), the capitalist class is modernity's main protagonist, whose world-making efforts make "all that

is solid melt into air." Barrington Moore's canonical *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy* (1993) makes a broadly similar point, arguing that democracy's rise in parts of Europe required a strong capitalist class ("no bourgeoisie, no democracy," in his pithy, oft-cited formulation). For their part, Marxist-inspired, Global South thinkers such as Amílcar Cabral and José Carlos Mariátegui argued that it was the lack of a capitalist class that prevented their societies from following this path of capitalist modernization (and, subsequently, proletarian revolution) (Sclofsky and Funk 2018).

Nevertheless, some critical political scientists reject the notion that class conflict represents *the* defining social schism. Typically informed by postmodernism, poststructuralism, and/or postcolonialism, such thinkers highlight Marxism's supposed inattentiveness to race, gender, North-South differences, and so on. While some of this criticism is disingenuous, it is accurate to say that an "intersectional" framework is needed to reveal how class is inflected with different social categories and subject-positions, such as race, gender, ethnicity, and citizenship (Funk 2015) – a topic that has been pursued with greater vigor vis-à-vis the working class (Chibber 2022).

Presently, there are vigorous debates regarding how to conceptualize the capitalist class. One of these concerns the extent to which there exists a consolidated "transnational" or "global" capitalist class that supersedes the nations and states and that has developed a global class consciousness. Samuel Huntington's (2004) assertion that many contemporary elites, economic and otherwise, "have little need for national loyalty, view national boundaries as obstacles that thankfully are vanishing, and see national governments as residues from the past whose only useful function is to facilitate the elite's global operations," resonates with this view, as do the writings of some Marxists (Robinson and Harris 2000). Yet there is little extant evidence that today's capitalist class acts or thinks independently of place-based concerns or is fatally undermining the state-based order (Funk 2022).

Scholars have also debated the extent to which the traditional, production-oriented capitalist class is being displaced by a "digital" ruling class that profits from compiling and processing *information* (Zuboff

2019). The implications of this shift to “surveillance capitalism” are antithetical to any substantive notion of freedom, equality, democracy, or human emancipation. It is clear that pursuing such lofty ideals – or addressing global challenges like climate change – requires curtailing the capitalist class’s power and inaugurating a social order based on solidarity and sustainability instead of exploitation and rapaciousness. Indeed, no matter how hegemonic it appears, the capitalist class always faces contestation. Critical political science has a significant role to play in identifying where the fissures lie.

KEVIN FUNK

References

- Chibber, Vivek. 2022. *The Class Matrix: Social Theory after the Cultural Turn*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Funk, Kevin. 2015. “The Global South Is Dead, Long Live the Global South! The Intersectionality of Social and Geographic Hierarchies in Global Capitalism.” *New Political Science* 3, no. 4: 582–603.
- Funk, Kevin. 2022. *Rooted Globalism: Arab-Latin American Business Elites and the Politics of Global Imaginaries*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Huntington, Samuel. 2004. “Dead Souls: The Denationalization of the American Elite.” *The National Interest*. <http://nationalinterest.org/article/dead-souls-the-denationalization-of-the-american-elite-620?page=show>.
- Marx, Karl. 1978 [1867]. “Capital, Volume One.” In *The Marx-Engels Reader*, 2nd edn, edited by Robert C. Tucker. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. 1978. [1888]. *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. In *Marx-Engels Reader*, 2nd edn, edited by Robert C. Tucker. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Moore, Jr., Barrington. 1993. *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Page, Benjamin I., Larry M. Bartels, and Jason Seawright. 2013. “Democracy and the Policy Preferences of Wealthy Americans.” *Perspectives on Politics* 11, no. 1: 51–73.
- Robinson, William I. and John Harris. 2000. “Towards a Global Ruling Class: Globalization and the Transnational Capitalist Class.” *Science & Society* 64, no. 1: 11–54.
- Sclofsky, Sebastián, and Kevin Funk. 2018. “The Specter That Haunts Political Science: The Neglect and Misreading of Marx in International Relations and Comparative Politics.” *International Studies Perspectives* 19, no. 1: 83–101.
- Slobodian, Quinn. 2018. *Globalists: The End of Empire and the Birth of Neoliberalism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Zuboff, Shoshana. 2019. *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. New York: PublicAffairs.

Further readings

- Das, Raju J. 2017. *Marxist Class Theory for a Skeptical World*. Leiden: Brill.
- Wright, Erik Olin. 2015. *Understanding Class*. Brooklyn: Verso.

See also

Class; Marxism; Ruling Class; Proletariat

67. Class

Class is a relatively new phenomenon in human history. For thousands of years, throughout much of humanity, there were no social classes, as people lived in classless communal societies. Classes have emerged only in the past 6,000 years over the 100,000-year history of known human societies. The emergence of classes in the world coincided with the emergence of the state as a superstructural institution that ruled over vast territories across the world. Subsequently, with the emergence of private property in land and other means of production, societies evolved through a variety of socio-economic and political systems that came to dominate social life throughout the world (Engels 1972).

Following the initial despotic states that set the stage for class divisions and class conflict, subsequent class-based societies under slavery, feudalism, and capitalism developed through successive modes of production over the past several thousand years. Thus, master versus slave, lord versus serf/peasant, and capital versus wage-labor became the sources of exploitation and oppression throughout recent history and led to much conflict and struggle between the contending class forces (Anderson 1974). Whereas under slavery the brutal oppression and exploitation of slaves by the slaveowners were clear for all to see, class divisions under European feudalism, and subsequently under capitalism, became more complex, especially under modern, advanced capitalism, notwithstanding the realities of rampant exploitation and oppression of wage-labor from the industrial revolution onward in all capitalist societies across the world (Dobb 1947; Hilton 1976).

Class has been defined in different ways by conventional and critical social theorists. Some, like Max Weber, focused on wealth, income, and other indicators, such as power, prestige, and status; while others, like Karl Marx, have explained it as based on social relations of production. Thus, as Marxist social scientists have pointed out, class under capitalism is lodged in one's relationship to the ownership and control of the means of production, which is, in essence, a *social* relationship of domination of one class (wage-labor) by another (capital) (Poulantzas 1975). This control and domination by capital

over labor is for the purpose of accumulation of capital through the profits made from the exploitation of wage-labor – that is, by capital's expropriation of surplus value created by wage-labor (Marx 1967).

It is this unequal social relation of class domination in capitalist society that has resulted in wealth and income inequality, leading to class conflict and class struggles that are characteristic of all capitalist societies today. Although there are several classes and groups in contemporary capitalist society, including the self-employed and the unemployed, wage-labor and capital form the core of class relations under capitalism. Marx envisioned three levels in the development of class consciousness among various classes in capitalist society, especially among the working class. These are the *economic* level (*class-in-itself*), the *social* level (socialization among members of the same class), and the *political* level (*class-for-itself*), when economically situated and socially interacted members of a class become conscious of their interests and act on these interests to bring about change in their favor. Thus, when an economically exploited and politically oppressed class, such as the working class, identifies itself as a working class and becomes conscious of its interests, and acts to advance its interests, it engages in class struggles. It is through such struggles that societies undergo social revolutions and societal transformations. Class struggles, then, become the *motive force* of social change and societal development (Marx and Engels 1974).

The class structure of capitalist society today is based on the existence of antagonistic social classes (labor versus capital) which are engaged in a life-and-death struggle to sustain or replace oppressive and exploitative class relations. This struggle is at base a struggle for state power, for it is through control of the state that a class becomes the dominant class, both economically *and* politically. Thus, given the wealth and power of the capitalist class, it is no surprise that the state in capitalist society is a *capitalist state* (Szymanski 1978). Class, then, has a great significance in not only its *economic* power based on accumulated wealth through the exploitation of labor, but also in terms of its *political* power centered on the *state*. Hence, ultimately, class struggles between contending class forces are in essence struggles for *state power* to maintain or transform society.

This transformation from one mode or system of economic production, social organization, and political rule to another comes about through a revolutionary process when oppressed and exploited classes finally prevail and take control of the state and reconstruct society anew based on a new set of principles in accordance with the interests of the oppressed class and ultimately of the entire society. However, this process does not happen automatically by itself solely through the resolution of class contradictions that exist in class society. It is cultivated by the advanced, class-conscious contingents of the oppressed classes that, through committed revolutionary leadership backed by revolutionary theory and ideology, facilitate the development of class consciousness among the laboring masses to rise up and take state power to rule society (Lenin 1967). This, in essence, is the way in which social revolutions take place, and it is through such analysis of the nature of classes and class struggles to transform society that a critical political science affords us to correctly understand and change society.

BERCH BERBEROGLU

References

- Anderson, Perry. 1974. *Passages from Antiquity to Feudalism*. London: New Left Books.
- Dobb, Maurice. 1947. *Studies in the Development of Capitalism*. New York: International Publishers.
- Engels, Frederick. 1972. *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*. New York: International Publishers.
- Hilton, Rodney, ed. 1976. *The Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism*. London: New Left Books.
- Lenin, V.I. 1967. "The State and Revolution." In *Selected Works* in three volumes. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Marx, Karl. 1967. *Capital*. Vol. 1. New York: International Publishers.
- Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. 1974. *The Communist Manifesto*. New York: International Publishers.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. 1975. *Political Power and Social Classes*. London: New Left Books.
- Szymanski, Albert J. 1978. *The Capitalist State and the Politics of Class*. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop.
- Berberoglu, Berch. 1994. *Class Structure and Social Transformation*. New York: Praeger.
- Sherman, Howard J. 2006. *How Society Makes Itself*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Szymanski, Albert J. 1983. *Class Structure: A Critical Perspective*. New York: Praeger.

Further readings

See also

Exploitation; Theories of the State; Capitalist Class; Proletariat; Petit Bourgeoisie

68. Colonialism

Colonialism refers to a range of violent and unjust acts of encounter, conquest, control, and settlement of lands and communities by those who did not originally inhabit those lands. This involves the formation – material, sensible, psychic, epistemic, spatial, affective, linguistic, ideological – of new communities that strongly identify with, and are legitimized and authorized by, what the newcomers have left behind. This formation of new communities often requires extraction, appropriation, and domination of these new spaces and their original inhabitants. According to Ania Loomba (1998, 8), while colonialism operated differently in different parts of the world, the common thread is that “everywhere it locked the original inhabitants and the newcomers into the most complex and traumatic relationships in human history.”

All attempts at defining concepts are also located in a historical moment. A definition of colonialism relevant for today requires addressing its persistent absence in the narratives of neoliberalism, neofascism, and planetary destruction that seem to quite often be seen as enough to describe our moment. Furthermore, a *political* definition for the moment must address the rents in the sensible content of the concept that remain even when we say that colonialism means many different things throughout history. This is because a consensus definition defeats the purpose when, in fact, a concept is constituted to name, in opposition, a reality in time and space. Thus, colonialism names the assemblage that colonial subjects create in their resistance to the colonizer. That is where the work of definition must begin, especially for critical political scientists.

Colonization has been an element of all human history, but its forms and directionalities have changed over time. While empires such as the Aztec, Roman, Mongols, Mughal, Ottoman, and the Chinese, from ancient eras well into the nineteenth century also involved colonization of land and people, those empires and modern colonialism differ in the kinds of relations established between the colonizer, the settler, and the native.

In undertaking a history of the present and without falling into the temptation of periodization which plagues almost all constellations within which colonialism is conventionally

placed, and the concepts from which it is often distinguished (e.g., imperialism, neo-colonialism), we find that modern colonialism entails the following key elements. First, colonialism involved both large (e.g., France, Germany) and small countries in Europe (e.g., Belgium, Netherlands), which replicated the patterns of the earlier grand empires (e.g., Spain, England, Portugal). The establishment of colonies included the imposition of alien forms of external administration, the establishment of segregated living spaces for the colonizer within the conquered territory, and the controlled movement of goods and people between the metropole (Europe) and the colony.

Second, insofar as colonialism involved a majority of the European multiple countries, its practice on a global scale consolidated a concept of “Europe” as the center and locus of economic, military, political, and cultural power in the world. This concept of European power also entailed claims to racial, cultural, and intellectual supremacy in relation to the people who were being conquered, controlled, and exploited by the colonizers. Third, this “Eurocentrism” simultaneously generated a concept of “the Other” (i.e., Orientalism), which came to view the global “East” (e.g., China) and “the South” (e.g., Africa) as a homogeneous and dialectical opposite of “the West” and “the North.”

Fourth, at the same time, this form of exercising power is different from the classical and ancient empires (e.g., Rome), because it involves the colonizer and the colonized, the settler and the native, tied together in a far more intimate relation than was attempted earlier. The degree to which “Europe” had to be “produced” (and continually so) is matched by the ardency with which the subjects have to be constituted in a way that they desire their own subjection as a form of recognition. It turns out that the undoing of this desire, as Frantz Fanon would have it, requires the undoing of the subjects involved in this relation – an undoing that has to match the violence of its initial production and subsequent reproduction. Thus, “culture” is produced as both a new space of resource extraction and capital accumulation (Gikandi 2011), and it becomes an independent variable that can at once explain the “muddle” of the colony (Forster 1924), the sense of inferiority experienced by colonized, and the supremacy of the colonizer. Christian

ideas of blood that informed the belief that religious difference was based in racial difference also sustained the practice of slavery and racial inequality, while co-existing with liberal modernity and its secular humanitarian promise (Biddick 1998).

Fifth, people are violently sundered from the sources of their sustenance – what Karl Marx calls “primitive accumulation” (Marx 1867) – in the process that creates capital as constantly needing more and more bodies ready for wage-labor and for the production of value. This “value” is produced in a second sundering – that between people and their own capacities to make and produce value so they retain only a minimal attachment to their body as living labor. The very idea of value in capitalism is thus derivative of the genocide of indigenous people, the murder of non-reproductive women, and the enslaved bodies most valuable because of their disposability, death, and destruction. A body that is most valuable in its death (as in the Zong case) (Philip et al. 2008) fuels a system of value production that derives from the production of commodities, and the production of the body as a commodity.

Sixth, the segregated communities formed by colonization and settlement advance this process by visibly cultivating forms of inequality and supremacy. This is also an essential component to the institution of the modern nation-state, where dominant settler communities, with their actions authorized and legitimized by a connection to a real or imagined origin, entails the minoritization of other (native) communities by exercising

a monopoly over the right to physical violence (Weber 2004). In this case, all modern states are settler states and the direct outcomes of modern colonialism.

ASMA ABBAS

References

- Biddick, Kathleen. 2016. *Make and Let Die: Untimely Sovereignities*. Cincinnati: Punctum Books.
- Cohen, Jeffrey. 2001. *The Postcolonial Middle Ages*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fanon, Frantz. 2018. *Alienation and Freedom*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Forster, E. M. 1924. *A Passage to India*. New York: Grosset & Dunlap.
- Gandhi, Leela. 1998. *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Gikandi, Simon. 2011. *Slavery and the Culture of Taste*, 2nd edn. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Heng, Geraldine. 2018. *The Invention of Race in the European Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Loomba, Ania. 1998. *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. London: Longman.
- Marx, Karl. 1992. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, Volume 1. New York: Penguin.
- Nirenberg, David. 1998. *Communities of Violence: Persecution of Minorities in the Middle Ages*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Philip, Marlene Nourbese, and Setaey Adamu Boateng. 2008. *Zong!: As Told to the Author by Setaey Adamu Boateng*. Mercury Press, 2008.
- Said, Edward. 1979. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage.
- Weber, Max. 2004. *The Vocation Lectures*. New York: Hackett Publishing.

69. Commodity fetishism

To understand capitalism in Marxian economics, one must first understand the commodity form. For this reason, Marx began *Capital* with his essay “The Commodity.” For Marx, a commodity is produced by human labor and sold on the market. Yet Marx also defined the commodity as having a “dual nature” (Marx 1990 [1867], 138) in that it possesses both use-value and exchange-value. Use-value constitutes merely the utility of the commodity and has no existence outside of its physical properties. For example, the down and other materials used in producing a winter jacket constitute the utility of the jacket (which is to keep a person warm in cold-climate winters). Exchange-value is abstracted from both the utility and the physical properties of the commodity (Marx 1990 [1867], 126–8) and represents its value on the market. Although exchange-value is usually expressed as price – for example, \$300 for a down winter jacket – exchange-value for Marx is actually a ratio. He represented this ratio as “ x commodity A = y commodity B” (1990, 139). For example, the exchange-value of a down winter jacket could be expressed as “1 down winter jacket = 240 candy bars” or any other quantity of any other commodity. Despite the commodity’s “dual nature,” Marx argued that use-value is not really value at all, for the elementary form of value in capitalism is realized only through exchange-value (1990 [1867], 152; 1992, 213). This becomes clear when one considers that exchange-value varies greatly across time and location (Marx 1990 [1867], 126) while use-value remains constant. To return to the example of a down winter jacket, the price of such a jacket would be quite different at Saks Fifth Avenue in Manhattan than it would at a Walmart in New Jersey, while the utility of a jacket would remain constant. Yet both the Saks Fifth Avenue consumer and the Walmart consumer are acutely aware of the class and cultural associations with their place of consumption. For the commodity form represents the very thing that mediates social relations under capitalism.

It is here – the social relations embedded within the production, exchange, and consumption of commodities – that Marx’s conception of commodity fetishism comes into play. Commodity fetishism is a process through which commodities come to be seen

as having an autonomous, almost fantastical, existence that is somehow outside of relationships between people. The people who produce the commodity, and the conditions under which they labor, are almost completely erased. The process of commodity fetishism is made possible by the fact that capitalism is organized around principles of exchange(-value) instead of use(-value). And for Marx, exchange-value “represents human labor pure and simple, the expenditure of human labor in general” (1990 [1867], 135). This general expenditure of human labor is highly abstract. The working conditions of the laborers who make the designer down jacket (for example, slaughtering the ducks and geese, washing and drying the duck and goose down, and sewing the down between layers of fabric) are far from the minds of consumers admiring the jacket within a brilliantly lit holiday display window at Saks Fifth Avenue. Central to the process of commodity fetishism is the transformation of the social into the natural (Marx 1992 [1885], 303). For Marx, labor and “the social relations between the individual workers” are concealed, which makes “those relations appear as relations between material objects, instead of revealing them plainly” (1990 [1867], 168–9). Put differently, human labor concerns social relations and is therefore social. Relations between material objects – whether between a down jacket and twinkling lights in a display window or between the ocean and the sand – appear to have an autonomous existence outside of the social and are therefore seen to be natural.

Commodity fetishism is an invaluable concept in critical political science; however, it is not without its controversies. One controversy concerns Marx’s use of the term “fetish” – a construct of the European Enlightenment that claimed to describe the religious practices and culture of the African “other” – and what that suggests about his views on race and colonialism. In his discussion of commodity fetishism, Marx famously made an analogy between the European commodity worshipper and the African fetish worshipper. The controversy concerns whether his discussion is drawing power from racist representations of African “savagery” (Bennett 2001, 118) or if he is reversing colonialist discourses by launching an “ironic attack on the European ruling classes as idolaters, as people who worship

things” (McNally 2011, 205). Outside of this controversy, Marx’s analogy has given rise to other important scholarship on the role of race in commodity fetishism, such as McClintock’s 1995 work on “commodity racism” (which explores how Victorian soap advertisements taught the British masses narratives of imperial “progress”). A second controversy concerns “ethical consumerism,” and whether alternative markets (such as “fair trade” products and local farmers’ markets) can at least partially defetishize the commodity form. While some contend that ethical consumerism demystifies the social relations of the production process and makes labor less abstract (Allen and Kovach 2000), others argue that “defetishization” is another form of commodity fetishism that masks the harms of capitalism (Fridell 2007; Gunderson 2013). Outside of this controversy, critical political science literature adjacent to ethical consumerism has used Marx’s conception of commodity fetishism to theorize the commodification of dissent through terms such as “commodity activism” (Mukherjee and Banet-Weiser 2012) and “commodity feminism” (Goldman 1992; Dowsett 2010).

Commodity fetishism has been described as “one of the great concepts of the Marxian heritage” (Jhally 1990, 27). The explanatory power of commodity fetishism has only increased since Marx’s day. Marx died in 1883 and, as such, did not live to witness the development of modern marketing in the early- to mid-twentieth century, let alone the dawn of social media and its legions of “influencers” hawking products and politics in the early twenty-first. As a concept firmly rooted in critical political economy, commodity fetishism challenges mainstream political science, which long ago separated the “political” from the “economy.”

JULIE E. DOWSETT

References

- Allen, Patricia, and Martin Kovach. 2000. “The Capitalist Composition of Organic: The Potential of Markets in Fulfilling the Promise of Organic Agriculture.” *Agriculture and Human Values* 17, no. 3: 221–32.
- Bennett, Jane. 2001. *The Enchantment of Modern Life: Attachments, Crossings and Ethics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Dowsett, Julie E. 2010. “Commodity Feminism and the Unilever Corporation: Or, How the Corporate Imagination Appropriates Feminism.” *Affinities: A Journal of Radical Theory, Culture, and Action* 4, no. 2: 9–16.
- Fridell, Gavin. 2007. “Fair-Trade Coffee and Commodity Fetishism: The Limits of Market-Driven Social Justice.” *Historical Materialism* 15, no. 4: 79–104.
- Goldman, Robert. 1992. *Reading Ads Socially*. New York: Routledge.
- Gunderson, Ryan. 2014. “Problems with the Defetishization Thesis: Ethical Consumerism, Alternative Food Systems, and Commodity Fetishism.” *Agriculture and Human Values* 31, no. 1: 109–17.
- Jhally, Sut. 1990. *The Codes of Advertising: Fetishism and the Political Economy of Meaning in the Consumer Society*. New York: Routledge.
- Marx, Karl. 1990. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, Vol. 1, translated by Ben Fowkes. London: Penguin.
- Marx, Karl. 1992. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, Vol. 2, translated by D. Fernbach. London: Penguin.
- McClintock, Anne. 1995. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Context*. New York: Routledge.
- McNally, David. 2011. *Monsters of the Market: Zombies, Vampires and Global Capitalism*. Chicago: Haymarket Books.
- Mukherjee, Roopali and Sarah Banet-Weiser, eds. 2012. *Commodity Activism: Cultural Resistance in Neoliberal Times*. New York: New York University Press.

Further readings

- Hunt, E.K. 2002. “Chapter 9: Karl Marx.” In *History of Economic Thought: A Critical Perspective*. Updated Second Edition, 204–47. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Jhally, Sut. 2006. “Advertising as Religion: The Dialectic of Technology and Magic.” In *The Spectacle of Accumulation: Essays on Culture, Media and Politics*, 85–97. New York: Peter Lang.
- Stallybrass, Peter. 1998. “Marx’s Coat.” In *Border Fetishisms: Material Objects in Unstable Times*, edited by Patricia Spyer, 183–207. New York: Routledge.

See also

Alienation; Exploitation; Objectification; Reification

70. Communism

Communism is one of the most misunderstood and misused concepts in political science. Most introductory texts on political science either exclude the term or put it under the discussion of “actually existing socialism” (AES) dictatorship regimes. Mainstream media in the West tend to see it as an ideology practiced by some authoritarian regimes, such as China and former Soviet Russia, which are rival to the liberal democratic West. Such usage of the term can be refuted by a quick look at the concept and its historical evolution. A rigorous analysis of the political institutions in Soviet Russia (Resnick and Wolff 2013) and China (Gerth 2020) helps us distinguish the concept of communism from historical and contemporary AES in various countries. Communism as the advanced stage of socialism is often seen by the political left as a favorable alternative to laissez-faire capitalism, though there are debates when it comes to the nature of communism and the means to reach it. Critical theorists continue to bring new voices into the debate from perspective such as environmentalism and postmodernism.

Communism refers to a theory or system of social organization in which all property is owned by the community and where work and consumption is distributed based on the principle: “From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs!” (Marx 2010 [1875], 87). The English term derives from the Latin word *communis*, meaning “shared” or “common,” and it came into wide use during the revolutionary 1840s influenced by the writings of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. Marx and Engels (2010 [1845–46], 47) describe an idyllic

communist society, where nobody has one exclusive sphere of activity but each can become accomplished in any branch he wishes, society regulates the general production and thus makes it possible for me to do one thing today and another tomorrow, to hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, rear cattle in the evening, criticize after dinner, just as I have a mind, without ever becoming hunter, fisherman, shepherd or critic.

Thus, the concept of communism, broadly defined, has been mostly associated with

aspirations for an alternative organization of the good life.

Philosophers had visions of a better society by communal effort such as Plato in ancient Greece, who suggested the governing class devote themselves to serving the interests of the whole community by sharing common ownership of material goods and their social lives; and enlightenment thinker Kant believed that a communistic utopia of “perpetual peace” between modern states could be achieved by upholding some universal rules. The idea of communism can also be found in various religions such as Buddhism, Monastic Christians, and the Chinese Daoist Tao Qian (AD 365–427) (Chiang 2009).

Yet, the contemporary use of communism is predominantly based on Marxism. Marx’s idea of communism emerged primarily from his critique of capitalist society coupled with his divergence from the “unscientific” utopian thinkers, such as Thomas More, Henri de Saint-Simon, Charles Fourier, and Robert Owen. Asserting that utopian socialism fails to address the root cause of exploitation and suffering in capitalist societies, Marx and Engels developed a comprehensive political economic critique of capitalism that requires a systemic change in the mode of production. First and foremost, capital and labor relations are essentially exploitation as capital pursues ever higher profit by extracting surplus value from workers. Alienation thus arises because workers have no control over their own labor or the products of their labor due to private ownership of the means of production in capitalist societies. Moreover, market capitalism accentuates uneven development, produces monopoly power, and leads to volatile boom and bust economic crises.

Besides the systemic critique of capitalism, Marx’s historical materialism sees communism a logical replacement for capitalist societies. Marx held that human history had progressed from ancient slave society through feudalism to capitalism. In each stage a dominant class uses its control of the means of production to exploit the labor of a larger class of workers. As the bourgeoisie overthrew the aristocracy and replaced feudalism with capitalism, Marx predicted in a brief description that internal “contradictions” in highly developed late capitalist societies will lead the proletariat to overthrow the bourgeoisie and replace capitalism with communism.

Despite its vagueness, Marx's vision of communist society has resulted in remarkable diversity in theoretical debates and political experiments in the twentieth century. Revolutionary Marxists hold a staunch belief that the path to communism is a revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat. V.I. Lenin and Mao Tse-Tung, for example, led revolutions in Russia and China, but both of these revolutions occurred in mostly rural and feudal societies, which was contrary to Marx's vision. In their later stages of experiment under Stalinism and Maoism communism was seen by many as a dystopian failure. By contrast, "revisionist" Marxists favored a gradual and parliamentary transition to socialism characterized by welfare state policies. For instance, Eduard Bernstein (1899), a leader of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, warned of the danger of a revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat turning into a dictatorship of "club orators and writers." Although the current experiments under the name of AES by communist political parties in a few remaining countries, especially China (Lin 2013), are increasingly integrated into global capitalism, it continues to be controversial if not a discredit to the left.

Today, although the idea of Marxian communism has become a lost cause in mainstream narratives and suffers from internal criticism within the left, it remains a driving force in the quest for a post-capitalist world, with new voices brought in by critical thinkers. It is helpful to critically engage the alternative to capitalism beyond orthodox Marxism especially when it comes to the current pressing issues. What kind of communistic society can organize humans to

combat ecological crisis in late capitalism? What are the possible new social forces that drive us toward a post-capitalist world in our divided nation-state system with a waning working-class consciousness? To contemplate these questions in our contemporary context would ensure that the idea of communism remains relevant in pursuit of a just and sustainable future for humanity.

JAKE LIN

References

- Bernstein, Eduard. 1899. *Evolutionary Socialism*. Available at www.marxists.org/reference/archive/bernstein/works/1899/evsoc/index.htm. Accessed on July 25, 2022.
- Chiang, Sing-chen Lydia. 2009. "Visions of Happiness: Daoist Utopias and Grotto Paradises in Early and Medieval Chinese Tales." *Utopian Studies* 20, no. 1: 97–120.
- Chun, Lin. 2013. *China and Global Capitalism: Reflections on Marxism, History, and Contemporary Politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gerth, Karl. 2020. *Unending Capitalism: How Consumerism Negated China's Communist Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marx, Karl. 2010 [1875]. "Critique of the Gotha Program." In *Marx & Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 24, 75–99. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. 2010 [1845–46]. "The German Ideology." In *Marx & Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 5, 19–539. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Resnick, Stephen A. and Richard D. Wolff. 2013. *Class Theory and History: Capitalism and Communism in the USSR*. New York: Routledge.

71. Community self-defense

The concept of community self-defense asserts the right of oppressed peoples to protect their interests “by any means necessary” (crow 2018). “By any means necessary” can include signing petitions and voting on one end of the legal spectrum to extralegal means of direct action, insurrection, or rebellion on the other end of the legal spectrum (see, Lukacs 1971; Barrow 2021). The Black Panther Party, for example, engaged in community self-defense not only through their armed patrols, but also through their community survival programs, which opened health clinics and free schools in poor black neighborhoods otherwise lacking these services (Newton 1973, 116–18).

Community *armed* self-defense is the collective group practice of temporarily taking up arms for defensive purposes, as part of larger engagements for self-determination in keeping with a liberatory ethics (Jayatilleka 2007). Self-defense usually describes countermeasures employed by an individual to protect their immediate personal safety and sometimes their property. In fact, in the United States, self-defense has been discussed almost exclusively in legal terms relating to individual “rights” recognized by governments or constitutions and only occasionally as a human right. By limiting the discussion to the rights of individuals, this framing fails to consider community interests, structural violence and oppression, and collective action. The dominant discourse on self-defense thus completely neglects the defense of communities, and it especially neglects any discussion of the political demands of people of color, women, immigrants, queers, and poor people, who are regularly subject to state and non-state violence directed at their communities.

Community self-defense in any form is thus not defined by laws but by ethics based in need (to protect) and the principles of anarchy (whether people call it that or not) by which groups of people collectively exercise their power in deciding their futures and determining how to respond to threats without relying on governments. As a concept, liberatory community armed self-defense takes into account legally unrecognized types of

violence and the structural limits that marginalized groups face in their ability to determine their own futures or collectively protect themselves through legal institutions.

For example, in 1973, when the American Indian Movement (AIM) took up arms to defend their people in the occupation at Wounded Knee, they did so to bring attention to the horrible living conditions on the reservations and the violence their communities faced both from a lack of basic services and from armed vigilante squads. The town of Wounded Knee was not itself under attack, but it represented what First Nations were facing everywhere in the United States and Canada. AIM’s stand was a clear example of community armed self-defense, but it does not fit neatly into the existing bourgeois-individualistic legal typologies of self-defense (Weyler 1982).

Liberatory community armed self-defense is different from other forms of armed action for two major reasons. The first is that it is a temporary but organized action. People can train in firearms tactics and safety, individually or together, but are called on more like a volunteer fire department – only when needed and in response to specific circumstances. Second, and possibly more importantly, power-sharing and egalitarian principles are incorporated into the group ethics and culture long before conflict is ever engaged through armed self-defense. These two overarching ideas separate community armed self-defense from most other types of armed conflict.

For instance, right-wing militias – like the anti-immigrant patrols of the Minutemen Militia along the U.S./Mexico border, or the racist Algiers Point Militia operating in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina – have nothing to do with the type of community armed self-defense rooted in collective liberatory principles. These militias are built on abstract fears and racist beliefs, conspiracy theories, and a macho culture where the strongest or loudest is the leader. They are typically organized in military-type hierarchies with no real accountability to the people in civil society or to the communities they claim to defend. However, the adoption of armed tactics in any conflict or threat situation always has the potential to morph temporary defensive measures into permanent military hierarchies unless conscious efforts

to counter that tendency are maintained by the armed self-defense group.

Armed conflict group configurations

Below is a quick summary of more common armed conflict group configurations.

Armed forces/law enforcement

The official armed forces and law enforcement organizations are mechanisms of power that use state-sanctioned “legitimized” violence to maintain the status quo of unequal power distribution among classes and other oppressed or marginalized groups. They tend to be highly organized and hierarchical and include police departments, private security firms, and national militaries.

Guerrilla armies

Guerrilla armies are small groups that use hit-and-run military tactics in a form of asymmetrical warfare. Some examples are Fidel Castro’s communist 26th of July Movement during the 1960s Cuban Revolution or the anarchists operating within the Kurdish region under the banner of the International Revolutionary People’s Guerrilla Forces (IRPGF) during the Rojava revolution.

Paramilitary or militia organizations

Volunteer citizen military formations are composed of nonprofessional fighters who train together for potential combat. In the US, these groups typically oppose the federal government but inhabit a subculture and organizational structure derivative of the professional military. Some examples of these groups include the Oath Keepers, Three Percenters, and the Ku Klux Klan (Belew 2018).

Terrorists

Terrorists use intentionally indiscriminate and horrific violence against civilians to create fear in furtherance of political, religious, or ideological aims by nonstate actors. Examples of contemporary terrorist organizations include the Army of God in the US, al-Qaeda, and ISIS. The term is sometimes cynically used by politicians and media to describe any opposition, such as the Earth Liberation Front and Greenpeace.

Armed propaganda/propaganda by the deed

Propaganda by the deed consists of violent actions meant to inspire others and spark insurrections or revolutions. Tactics include, but are not limited to, bombings, armed takeovers of buildings, armed expropriations from banks, and assassinations. These actions are usually followed by communiques sent to the media stating the political reasons for the actions. Examples of such groups include the Weather Underground (1974) in the US, Angry Brigade in England, and the Red Army Faction in Germany (Berkman 1971; Sorel 1961, Chap. 6; Trautmann 1997 [1912]; Varon 2004).

Armed insurrection

Armed insurrections or rebellions are characterized by the open resistance of the masses of people against established power and authority. It is usually precipitated by a spontaneous triggering event, and not typically well-organized before the triggering event. The “spark” for the uprising has usually been preceded by longer-term unaddressed grievances (Fanon 1961, Chap. 1).

Principles of community armed self-defense

The armed component of liberatory social movements should never become the center of that movement; otherwise, it risks becoming a standing military. The liberatory framework of community armed self-defense is built on anarchist principles of mutual aid (cooperation), direct action (taking action without waiting on the approval of the authorities), solidarity (recognizing that the well-being of disparate groups is tied together), and collective autonomy (community self-determination). Defensive arms should be used only for the goals of collective liberation and not to seize permanent power.

Arms are not the first line of defense but are only taken up after other forms of conflict resolution have been exhausted by a community. The use of arms is only effective in the long term if it is part of a dual power strategy. Dual power means resisting exploitation and oppression, while also developing autonomous initiatives toward liberation and self-governance and as part of other efforts toward self-sufficiency and self-determination. Thus, those engaged in community

self-defense with guns should hold the same power as others involved in other forms of community defense or self-sufficiency. Carrying arms should be seen as a privileged task, with the same importance as childcare, growing food, or taking out the garbage. To maintain a balance of power, all armed tasks and training should be rotated among all those willing to participate in those tasks.

All firearms training needs to include dynamic and evolving liberatory ethics and practices in addition to how-to and safety training. There should be an emphasis on challenging internalized assumptions about class, gender, and race to interrupt typical gun culture. There are many tactical considerations regarding the need to avoid replicating the dominant gun culture by keeping arms and arms training from becoming the central focus of a social movement, whether from habit, culture, or romanticization.

scott crow

References

- Barrow, Clyde W. 2021. "Legal and Illegal Political Tactics in Marxist Political Theory." In *Research Handbook on Law and Marxism*, edited by Paul O'Connell and Umut Ozsu, 6–20. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc.
- Belew, Kathleen. 2018. *Bring the War Home: The White Power Movement and Paramilitary America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Berkman, Alexander. 1971. "Propaganda by the Deed." In *The Essential Works of Anarchism*, edited by Marshall S. Shatz, 356–92. New York: Bantam Books.
- crow, scott, ed. 2018. *Setting Sights: Histories and Reflections on Community Armed Self-Defense*. Oakland, CA: PM Press.
- Fanon, Frantz. 1961. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press.
- Jayatileka, Dayan. 2007. *Fidel's Ethics of Violence: The Moral Dimension of The Political Thought of Fidel Castro*. London: Pluto Press.
- Lukacs, Georg. 1971. "Legality and Illegality." In *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics* by Georg Lukacs, 256–71. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.
- Newton, Huey P. 1973. *Revolutionary Suicide*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
- Sorel, Georges. 1961. *Reflections on Violence*. New York: Collier Books.
- Trautmann, William E. 1997 [1912]. "Direct Action and Sabotage." In *Direct Action and Sabotage: Three Classic I.W.W. Pamphlets*, edited by Salvatore Salerno. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr.
- Varon, Jeremy. 2004. *Bringing the War Home: The Weather Underground, the Red Army Faction, and Revolutionary Violence in the Sixties and Seventies*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Weather Underground. 1974. *Prairie Fire: The Politics of Revolutionary Anti-Imperialism – The Political Statement of the Weather Underground*. San Francisco: Communication Co.
- Weyler, Rex. 1982. *Blood of the Land: The Government and Corporate War Against the American Indian Movement*. New York: Everest House.

See also

Direct Action; Diversity of Tactics; Anarchism

72. Contradiction

Contradiction is a core concept of critical political science. On the surface, contradiction does not seem to be an overtly political concept, much less a specifically critical one. However, the concept of contradiction is foundational to one of the core perspectives adopted by critical political scientists: the dialectical method, or simply, dialectics – a category which itself has its own diversity of potential meanings and usages. Different conceptions of dialectics often differ specifically in how they use the concept of contradiction (or whether they prefer a different concept, such as antagonism).

David Harvey (2014), who delineated at least 17 forms of contradiction in capitalist societies, describes two main definitions of contradiction. First, the logical or Aristotelian conceptualization where contradictions are logical impossibilities rooted in an assumption of self-identity and coherence whereby something cannot be itself and not be itself at the same time ($A=A$, $B=B$; $\text{not-}A=\text{not-}A$, $\text{not-}B=\text{not-}B$, etc.). While the two usages of the term are related, particularly for a thinker like Theodor Adorno, the second definition of contradiction focuses on incommensurable facets of lived reality. In this respect, a contradiction, according to Claus Offe (1984, 132) “is the tendency inherent within a specific mode of production to destroy those very pre-conditions on which its survival depends.” The historical development of a contradiction must inevitably culminate in some crisis event that makes the contradiction perceptible as a crisis in that society. In other words, there are aspects of society that co-exist but are fundamentally irreconcilable, which eventually leads to crisis and/or revolution. This concept of contradiction comes to critical political science through G.W.F. Hegel, Karl Marx, and the Frankfurt School of Critical Theory, although it was more or less discarded in the Post-Marxism of Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe as well as other non-dialectical critical theorists, who replaced the concept of contradiction with a concept of antagonism, among others.

The Hegelian dialectic (also known as the speculative or positive dialectic) can be understood as the progressive movement of ideas through history through the emergence and eventual supersession of con-

traditions. This is typically represented as “thesis-antithesis-synthesis,” although Hegel never actually used this formulation. Hegel (1977; 1991) elucidates his concept of dialectics in a variety of different ways, but the two most salient examples are through his discussion of being, nothing, and becoming, and – as made famous by Alexandre Kojève’s (1980) lectures on the master/slave dialectic – in Hegel’s parable of the lord and bondsman. In the first instance, being and nothing are both concepts necessary to understand the other, and yet they clearly contradict one another. The concept of becoming emerges to resolve the contradiction. In the second instance, the bondsman or slave gains a deeper knowledge and experience in relation to the lord or master precisely because the bondsman does all of the work. The lord loses the same knowledge and experience and, in a way, becomes beholden to the bondsman. The lord is also further tied to the bondsman for his identity for without the slave there is no lord. In Kojève’s hands, the bondsman is then able to overcome their enslavement and achieve freedom, thereby resolving the contradictory relationship.

For Marx (1978), contradiction is an omnipresent fact of material (and also ideological) social relations, especially within class societies. Under feudalism, the central contradiction is between lord and serf. This contradiction is superseded by the emergence of the initially unlanded bourgeoisie (combined with plenty of serf revolts). Capitalism thus emerges as a resolution to the contradiction within the socioeconomic relationship between the lord and serf. Under capitalism, the central contradiction is between the bourgeoisie who own and control the means of production and the proletariat who work on the means of production but do not own or control them. The bourgeoisie does not technically labor, and yet they earn their wealth through the exploitation of the proletariat and through the expropriation of the surplus value of their labor. The contradiction can only be resolved by a revolutionary movement of the proletariat to seize control of the means of production (and taking and transforming political power to do so), abolishing the private ownership of the means of production, abolishing the bourgeoisie, and eventually self-abolishing itself to create a classless and radically democratic society that is ostensibly free of fundamental social

contradictions (though logical contradictions are sure to remain).

However, through the first quarter of the twenty-first century, social contradictions remain in capitalist societies. It was the endurance of supposedly ruptural contradictions that led to Adorno's (1973 [1966]; 2008 [1964–65]) negative-dialectical assertion that the positive resolution of contradictions cannot be assumed possible, in part, because there is a conceptual non-identity between opposites and a non-identity between concepts and the world they aim to describe. Hegel more so than Marx posited the unity of opposites, which is what produces the positive resolution of contradiction. Marx asserted a strong role for the agency of the working class to produce the positive resolution of the contradictions of capitalism through the transformative politics of class struggle and the construction of a global socialist or communist society. Adorno argued, having apparently observed the transhistorical failure of the proletariat to fulfill this role, alongside the absolute implosion of progress represented by the success of fascism and the Holocaust, that the contradictions of capitalism were just as likely to destroy everything and everyone as they were to open up the opportunity to achieve emancipatory change.

With Laclau and Mouffe's (1985) "invention" of Post-Marxism, the concept of antagonism replaces that of contradiction, and along with it, the critique of capitalism and the focus on the contradictions of capitalism as the basis for a more or less specific form of revolutionary transformation. Antagonisms are important tensions within social relations that can open up spaces for radical change with varying degrees of specificity and predictability, but antagonistic forces are more capable of social co-habitation than contradictions. According to Laclau and Mouffe, antagonism also emphasizes contingency and subjectivity in ways that more orthodox Marxist formulations do not take into account.

Today, critical political scientists run the gamut from Hegelians, to Marxists, to

Adornoians, to Post-Marxists with respect to how they use (or intentionally do not use) the concept of contradiction.

BRYANT WILLIAM SCULOS

References

- Adorno, Theodor. 1973 [1966]. *Negative Dialectics*. New York: Continuum.
- Adorno, Theodor. 2008 [1964–65]. *Lectures on Negative Dialectics: Fragments of a Lecture Course*. Malden, MA: Polity.
- Harvey, David. 2014. *Seventeen Contradictions and the End of Capitalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hegel, G.W.F. 1977. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hegel, G.W.F. 1991. *Science of Logic*. New York: Prometheus Books.
- Kojève, Alexandre. 1980. *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel: Lectures on the Phenomenology of Spirit*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Laclau, Ernesto and Chantal Mouffe. 1985. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.
- Marx, Karl. 1978. *The Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd edn. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Offe, Claus. 1984. *Contradictions of the Welfare State*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.

Further readings

- Althusser, Louis. 1962. "On Contradiction and Overdetermination." Available online at: <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/althusser/1962/overdetermination.htm>.
- Ollman, Bertell. 2003. *Dance of the Dialectic: Steps in Marx's Method*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Sculos, Bryant William. 2016. "Negative Dialectical Interpretation: Contradiction and Critique." *Interpretation in Political Theory*, eds. Clement Fatovic and Sean Noah Walsh. New York: Routledge.
- Tse-tung, Mao. 1937. "On Contradiction." Available online at: https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-1/mswv1_17.htm.

See also

Marxism; Critical Theory; Alienation; Exploitation

73. Corporate liberalism

Corporate liberalism is the term coined by historian Martin J. Sklar to describe the social movement and ideology that forged and legitimated the corporate reconstruction of American capitalism and society during the Progressive Era (1890–1916). Sklar introduced the idea in “Woodrow Wilson and the Political Economy of Modern United States Liberalism” in 1960, and further developed the concept in his seminal work, *The Corporate Reconstruction of American Capitalism, 1890–1916: The Market, The Law, and Politics* (1988). In both works, Sklar challenges mainstream accounts that view the reforms and political conflicts of the Progressive Era through the lens of conventional political categories that juxtapose liberal reformers (depicted as critics of corporate power) with conservatives (depicted as defenders of the capitalist order). His analysis shows this to be a false dichotomy. Liberals and conservatives were both pro-corporate, which is to say, they were corporate-liberals. He argues that their major policy differences with respect to the large corporation are better understood as responses to the “trust question,” that is, the issue of how government should respond to concentrated economic power in the marketplace. Thus corporate liberalism encompassed the full (liberal) ideological spectrum. These ideological variants (Roosevelt on the left, Wilson center-left, and Taft center-right), Sklar (1988, 35–40) argues, anticipated the major divisions in American politics in the twentieth century.

In his 1960 essay, Sklar makes the case that corporate liberalism, typified by Wilson’s political thought and policies, prevailed as the alternative to socialism. In *The Corporate Reconstruction*, he greatly expands his analysis of the early decades of the twentieth century to show how political and corporate leaders, economists, legislators, judges, liberal reformers, and political thinkers formulated the premises and methods of corporate liberalism in an effort to adapt nineteenth-century liberal institutions and ideology to the exigencies of corporate capitalism. He documents in rich detail how corporate liberalism developed as a cross-class movement that ultimately undermined or contained populist and socialist challenges to the emergent corporate capitalist order by

incorporating or coopting elements of their policy agendas.

The concept of corporate liberalism gained widespread currency among thinkers and activists on the Left during the 1960s and thereafter. Sklar’s co-editor at *Studies on the Left*, James Weinstein, published *The Corporate Ideal in the Liberal State* in 1968, which was influential in shaping the evolving perception of corporate liberalism. Weinstein’s analysis focused on the National Civic Federation, a corporate-led organization that included political and labor leaders (notably, Samuel Gompers) all of whom collaborated in efforts to undermine socialism in the labor movement. Weinstein (1968, 118) introduced the concept of the “corporate ideal” to refer to the deceptive ideological argument that identified “large corporations with an idealized social reality,” in which efficiency and responsibility had supplanted the anarchic competition of industrial capitalism and its attendant political corruption.

In subsequent interpretations of corporate liberalism, the corporate ideal came to represent a blending of corporatist ideas with liberalism in an effort to legitimate emergent corporatist institutions and the corporate capitalist state (Eakins 1972; Radosh 1972; Barrow 1990). In Jeffrey Lustig’s (1982) extensive analysis of liberal political thought during the Progressive Era, corporate liberalism is more aptly viewed as an American version of liberal corporatism. The corporate ideal of efficiency and accountability has also been used to refer to the adoption of corporate-capitalist organizational and economic models in the creation of public universities (Barrow 1990) and science-based industries (Noble 1977).

In rejecting corporatist interpretations of corporate liberalism, Sklar (1988) emphasizes that while justifying an expansion of governmental power (the positive state), corporate liberalism nevertheless preserves the basic elements of a liberal constitutional order founded on the separation of state and society. This conclusion is supported by his analysis of the legal and political resolution of the trust question which established a regime that balances government regulation with corporate self-regulation; thus, rejecting a purely statist (socialist or corporatist) solution.

Just as there are corporate-liberal variants within the ideological spectrum of corporate

liberalism, so are there interpretative variants with respect to the centrality of corporatist ideas in corporate liberalism. There is general agreement, however, that the critique of laissez-faire liberalism during the Progressive Era produced a distinctly American vision of a corporate-liberal society. Herbert Croly, the most influential corporate-liberal thinker of this period, envisioned a new social and political order that in many ways mirrored and complemented the hierarchical organizational structure of the large corporation, while preserving principles of constitutionalism (Croly 1993; Bowman 1996, 80–91). For the past 100-plus years, corporate liberalism has not only legitimated the dominant position of the corporate capitalist class in the United States, but it has also reshaped political discourse, legal doctrine, and the ideological contours of the social sciences (Bowman 1996).

SCOTT R. BOWMAN

References

- Barrow, Clyde W. 1990. *Universities and the Capitalist State: Corporate Liberalism and the Reconstruction of American Higher Education, 1894–1928*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Bowman, Scott R. 1996. *The Modern Corporation and American Political Thought: Law, Power, and Ideology*. University Park: Penn State University Press.
- Croly, Herbert. 1993. *The Promise of American Life*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Eakins, David. 1972. "Policy-Planning for the Establishment." In *A New History of Leviathan*, edited by Ronald Radosh and Murray N. Rothbard, 188–205. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co.
- Hawley, Ellis W. 1978. "The Study and Discovery of a 'Corporate Liberalism'." *Business History Review* 52, no. 3 (Autumn): 309–20.
- Lustig, R. Jeffrey. 1982. *Corporate Liberalism: The Origins of Modern American Political Theory, 1890–1920*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Noble, David F. 1977. *America by Design: Science, Technology, and the Rise of Corporate Capitalism*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.
- Radosh, Ronald. 1972. "The Myth of the New Deal." In *A New History of Leviathan*, edited by Ronald Radosh and Murray N. Rothbard, 147–87. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co.
- Sklar, Martin J. 1988. *The Corporate Reconstruction of American Capitalism, 1890–1916: The Market, The Law, and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sklar, Martin J. 1960. "Woodrow Wilson and the Political Economy of Modern United States Liberalism." *Studies on the Left* I, no. 3 (Fall): 17–47.
- Weinstein, James. 1968. *The Corporate Ideal in the Liberal State, 1900–1918*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Domhoff, G. William. 1978. *The Powers That Be: Processes of Ruling Class Domination in America*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Domhoff, G. William. 1986–87. "Corporate-Liberal Theory and the Social Security Act: A Chapter in the Sociology of Knowledge." *Politics and Society* 15, no. 3: 295–330.
- Domhoff, G. William. 1990. *The Power Elite and the State: How Policy is Made in America*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Haber, Samuel. *Efficiency and Uplift: Scientific Management in the Progressive Era, 1890–1920*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kolko, Gabriel. 1963. *The Triumph of Conservatism: A Re-Interpretation of American History, 1900–1916*. New York: Free Press.
- Kolko, Gabriel. 1965. *Railroads and Regulation, 1877–1916*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Further readings

See also

Clyde W. Barrow; Gabriel Kolko; William Appleman Williams

74. Corporate power

The study of corporate power has long presented challenges to both mainstream and critical political scientists. For mainstream American political scientists, the large corporation is nothing more than an interest group. If the “political” behavior of large corporations is discussed it is incidental to the topics of lobbying, campaign contributions, or the revolving door of lobbyists, with little or no attention to the structural advantages of business (Luger 2000). Even less often studied, but equally important, are the broader public relations efforts, sponsored think tanks, policy planning groups, and foundations that mediate and exercise corporate power (Domoff 2021). A corporate sponsored conservative legal movement has provided another avenue for exerting political influence. Now in control of the US Supreme Court, conservative justices have allowed unregulated money to flood into the political system, made rulings that weaken unions, reversed anti-trust doctrine, made class action lawsuits more difficult, and rolled back punitive damages awards (Cohen 2020).

Yet, the “economic” face of corporate power has received even less attention from mainstream political scientists. This type of power includes power over what is produced; where and how work is organized; the wages, benefits, and employment rights of workers; which advertising images shape consumer consciousness; the development of technology; and the pollutants to which we are subjected on a daily basis.

Robert Dahl, the most celebrated pluralist of the 1950s and 1960s, had by 1970 come to understand that corporations were not mere interest groups, but instead exercised political authority. For Dahl, companies such as General Motors, which at the time was the nation’s largest, was anything but “private.” It was a public institution as much as the Post Office (Dahl 1970, 120). Moreover, by 1977, he wrote that for most Americans the daily experience of work was spent “not within a democratic system, but instead within a hierarchical structure of subordination” (Dahl 1977, 8). Dahl’s longtime collaborator, Charles Lindblom, concluded his book *Politics and Markets* by noting that the large corporation did not neatly fit within democratic theory (Lindblom 1977). In fact, corporations have always been creatures of

the state with rights such as limited liability defined by public authority. They have never been simply private (Ciepley 2013). Since corporations make authoritative decisions, their economic power is no less political by being labeled “economic.” They are, in fact, private governments that exercise substantial authority over the public and should be studied by political scientists as political institutions (Engler 1961).

For example, anti-trust policy historically sought to protect economic and political liberty by preserving competitive markets. The conservative reorienting of antitrust to focus on claims of consumer welfare has allowed for oligopolistic, if not monopoly, concentration across the economy. The result is capitalism without competition (Tepper and Hearn 2019). The corporate giants of today: Amazon, Apple, Facebook, Google, and Microsoft, each of which exercise hegemonic platform power, together form the building blocks of surveillance capitalism, whereby these firms extract personal information to predict and shape behavior (Zuboff 2019). Unlike the large firms of the post-World War II era, today’s corporate titans have fewer employees and subcontract, outsource, and franchise many of their functions. The courts have allowed dominant firms to control its subcontractors through detailed contractual agreements, without being held responsible for statutory employment protections such as health and safety laws, overtime, or minimum wages laws (Sheinbaum 2019). Corporate resource allocation decisions are now governed by the ideology of maximizing shareholder value. Instead of retaining earnings for reinvestment, which was the pattern in the early post-World War II period, profits are now directed to stock buy backs and dividends with fewer resources available to compensate workers or to enhance the productive capacities of the enterprise (Lazonick and Shin 2020). The 2007–09 financial crisis exposed the economic and political consequences of the financialization of the American economy and its dependence on Wall Street. Too big to fail turned into too big to jail. Deferred prosecution agreements – fines without convictions or admissions of guilt – now characterize the administration of justice with respect to corporate elites (Garrett 2014).

Part of the movement to maximize shareholder value entails reversing the labor-management accords that were central to post-World War II prosperity – powerful

unions, long-term contracts, cost of living wage increases, pensions, health insurance, and so on. These accords have been replaced by the fissured workplace and the gig economy (Weil 2014). As a result, intra-firm job mobility and wage fairness pressures have been undermined. Employment contracts now often include mandatory arbitration clauses (Colvin 2017), the waiving of the right to join in class action grievances, and non-compete clauses, even among low-wage fast food workers (Sheinbaum 2019). The doctrine of at-will employment legally secures this domination of the corporation over the worker. Since the 1970s, aggressive anti-union consulting firms have been deployed to further prevent workers from unionizing (Logan 2006). State and local governments now compete to attract and retain jobs through economic development packages (i.e., corporate subsidies) whose value tripled between 1990 and 2015 to approximately \$50 billion annually or roughly the equivalent of all state corporate income tax revenue (Bartik 2019).

The enormous economic power wielded by corporations in multiple spheres of social and political life requires political scientists to integrate both faces of corporate power if we are to develop a more comprehensive and critical account of power in America.

STAN LUGER

References

- Bartik, Timothy. 2019. *Making Sense of Incentives*. Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute.
- Ciepley, David. 2013. "Beyond Public and Private: Toward a Political Theory of the Corporation." *American Political Science Review* 107, no. 1, (February): 139–58.
- Cohen, Adam. 2020. *Supreme Inequality*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Colvin, Alexander. 2017. "The Growing Use of Mandatory Arbitration." Washington, DC: *Economic Policy Institute*, September 27.
- Dahl, Robert. 1970. *After the Revolution*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Dahl, Robert. 1977. "On Removing Certain Impediments to Democracy in the United States." *Political Science Quarterly* 92, no. 1 (Spring): 1–20.
- Domhoff, William G. 2021. *Who Rules America?* 8th edn. New York: Routledge Publishers.
- Engler, Robert. 1961. *The Politics of Oil*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Garrett, Brandon. 2014. *Too Big To Jail*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lindblom, Charles. 1977. *Politics and Markets*. New York: Basic Books.
- Logan, John. 2006. "The Union Avoidance Industry in the United States." *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 44, no. 4 (December): 651–75.
- Lazonick, William and Shin, Jang-Shin. 2020. *Predatory Value Extraction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Luger, Stan. 2000. *Corporate Power, American Democracy, and the Automobile Industry*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sheinbaum, Marshall. 2019. "Antitrust, the Gig Economy, and Labor Market Power." *Law and Contemporary Problems* 82: 45–64.
- Tepper, Johnathan and Denise Hearn. 2019. *The Myth of Capitalism*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.
- Weil, David. 2014. *The Fissured Workplace*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Zuboff, Shoshana. 2019. *Surveillance Capitalism*. New York: Public Affairs.

See also

Ruling Class; Corporate Liberalism; Paul M. Sweezy; Paul A. Baran; Critical Political Economy

75. Council communism

As the society of revolutionary Russia gradually hardened into its new shape in the years after 1918 and political power was increasingly concentrated in the hands of a bureaucratic élite, oppositional movements continually emerged, both inside Russia and abroad, that sought to turn the tide. One very early protest against the trends in Russia was expressed in the Netherlands and Germany by former Bolshevik sympathisers, who would later become known as “council communists” – a term that was probably used from 1921 onwards (Kool 1970, 575).

The most prominent spokespeople of this protest were the German educator Otto Rühle (1874–1943) and two Dutchmen; the poet and classicist Herman Gorter (1864–1927) and the astronomer Anton(ie) Pannekoek (1873–1960). These intellectuals had initially been enthusiastic admirers of developments in Russia, but their mood changed quickly. The most important reason for their turnabout was the efforts of the Communist International established in 1919 to promote the Bolshevik example as an international model. In 1920, Pannekoek published his pamphlet *World Revolution and Communist Tactics*, in which he defended the proposition that revolutionaries in Western Europe should use very different tactics from their comrades in Russia. In Western Europe, the influence of an old, experienced bourgeoisie made itself felt at every level of society. In Russia and Eastern Europe, by contrast, the bourgeoisie was still young and relatively weak. For this reason, East-European workers had fewer ideological prejudices and were more receptive to Marxist ideas. Accordingly, the struggle against bourgeois institutions such as parliaments and trade unions had to be central in the West.

In his pamphlet “*Left-Wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder*,” V.I. Lenin challenged the Dutch and German left-wingers’ standpoints, which he argued were spreading confusion among those on the left. While Lenin (1940 [1920], 7) acknowledged that there was an “enormous difference” between “backward Russia” and “the advanced countries of Western Europe,” he considered the universal significance of the Russian experience far more important: “it is the Russian model that reveals to all countries something – and

something highly significant – of their near and inevitable future.” By focusing centrally on “the international validity” of “certain fundamental features of our revolution” in this way, Lenin accentuated the sharpening contradictions within the international Communist movement. His response sparked intense debates inside the West-European Communist Parties.

Within the council-communist movement, criticism of Russia rapidly grew more intense. Otto Rühle (1920) was perhaps the first to conclude that the Bolsheviks were not building socialism. Rühle argued that the Bolsheviks had tried to skip over an entire epoch by leaping directly from feudalism to socialism. The delayed world revolution had made this attempt a failure. The outcome was “a frightful disappointment” as the Bolsheviks had instituted an ultra-centralism that corresponded completely to the bourgeois character of their revolution. Rühle insisted that a proletarian state and socialist economy required a system of councils as opposed to the centralized bureaucracy constructed by the Bolsheviks.

Thus, by 1921, the council-communist movement began to demarcate itself clearly from official Communism. The movement’s starting points can be summarized simply. First, capitalism is in decline and should be abolished immediately. Second, the only alternative to capitalism is a democracy of workers’ councils, based on an economy controlled by the working class. Third, the bourgeoisie and its social-democratic allies are trying to save capitalism from its fate by means of “democratic” manipulation of the working class. Fourth, in order to hasten the establishment of a democracy of councils, this manipulation must be consistently resisted by leftists and the working class. This means, on the one hand, boycotting all parliamentary elections and, on the other hand, systematically fighting against the old trade unions (which are organs for the joint management of capitalism). Finally, Soviet-type societies such as the one emerging in Russia are not an alternative to capitalism but, rather, a new form of capitalism.

These five starting points are the parameters within which debates have taken place among council communists over the past eighty years. There has been considerable room for fundamental differences of opinion within these parameters, however, and the

differences have been sharpened by the movement's ongoing decline, which reduced the remaining council communists to small groups. In these groups, internal theoretical debate has often been more important than practical political work.

Organized council communism disappeared from Germany after Hitler seized power in 1933, although groups remained active in the resistance (Ihlau 1969). In the Netherlands, several small groups emerged, one of which, the Groups of International Communists (GIC), continued to serve as a co-ordinating center for international discussions about council communism until the late 1930s and, among other things, published a journal (*Rätekorrespondenz* 1934–37) towards this end. Several texts appeared in the early issues of this periodical that subsequently functioned as the substantive platform of the international council communist movement. The first such text was "The Rise of a New Labor Movement" by Dutch educator Henk Canne Meijer (1890–1962), who can justly be seen as the GIC's "soul" (Brendel 1974, 259). Canne Meijer (1935) argued that the historical role of the old labor movement (made up of parties, trade unions, and co-operatives) was exhausted and that a new labor movement was now rising up based entirely on autonomous proletarian activity.

A second influential text was the German journalist and teacher Helmut Wagner's (1904–89) 1934 "Theses on Bolshevism." Wagner characterized the Soviet Union as state capitalism without a bourgeoisie, constantly zigzagging between the interests of workers and peasants. The Five-Year Plans and forced collectivization were nothing but attempts to keep the contradiction between these two classes under control by force. A few years later, Anton Pannekoek (1948) came to a different conclusion with his claim that the Bolsheviks had carried out a bourgeois revolution, so that, rather than following incorrect policies, they had followed the only possible policies. Their only "mistake" had been to imagine that they were building socialism rather than capitalism.

A generation later, council communism enjoyed a renewed limelight, particularly while the student movement was flourishing in the 1960s, particularly in Germany, Italy and France. Classic texts were republished and veteran council communists such

as Mattick and the Dutch journalist Cajo Brendel (born in 1915 and perhaps the last true disciple of Pannekoek) were popular speakers and writers. The "old" council communism was often integrated in an eclectic way into a "new" theory or worldview. This new variant of council communism was most evident in Gabriel and Daniel Cohn-Bendit's book, *Obsolete Communism: The Left-Wing Alternative* (1968). With the decline of the 1968 movements, council communism also largely disappeared from sight once more, although groups are still active in various places in Western Europe, the United States, and Canada.

MARCEL MARIUS VAN DER LINDEN

References

- Brendel, Cajo. 1974. "Die 'Gruppe Internationale Kommunisten' in Holland: Persönliche Erinnerungen aus den Jahren 1934–39." *Jahrbuch Arbeiterbewegung* 2: 253–63.
- Canne Meijer, Henk. 1935. "The Rise of a New Labor Movement." *International Council Correspondence* 1, no. 10 (August): 1–26.
- Cohn-Bendit, Daniel and Gabriel Cohn-Bendit. 1968. *Obsolete Communism: The Left-Wing Alternative*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ihlau, Olaf. 1969. *Die Roten Kämpfer. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung in der Weimarer Republik und im Dritten Reich*. Meisenheim am Glan: Hain.
- Kool, Frits, ed. 1970. *Die Linke gegen die Parteiherrschaft*. Olten: Walter-Verlag.
- Lenin, V.I. 1940 [1920]. "Left-Wing" Communism, *An Infantile Disorder*. New York: International Publishers.
- Pannekoek, Anton. 1975 [1948]. *Lenin as Philosopher: A Critical Examination of the Philosophical Basis of Leninism*. London: Merlin Press.
- Ruhle, Otto. 1920. "Moskau und wir." *Die Aktion*, October 2.

Further readings

- Guérin, Daniel. 1970. *Anarchism: From Theory to Practice*, translated by Mary Klopfer. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Pannekoek, Anton. 1977. "The Theory of the Collapse of Capitalism." *Capital and Class* 1: 59–81.
- Pannekoek, Anton. 1970. *Workers' Councils*. Cambridge, MA: Root & Branch.
- Van der Linden, Marcel. 2009. *Western Marxism and the Soviet Union. A Survey of Critical Theories and Debates since 1917*. Chicago: Haymarket.

Section I: Crises of Capitalism

76. Economic crisis

Karl Marx predicted in *Capital*, Volume 1, that economic crises were not only an inherent feature of capitalist economies, but that crises would occur more frequently, and with more intensity over time. Political economists have identified significant crisis markers in the study of capitalism (Sismondi 1996 [1815]; Kotz 1990). Historically, in the Marxian formulation, we can conceive of economic crises as accompanying capital-intensive growth – the rising organic composition of capital – which generates crisis events in capitalist economies due to the increased cost of goods, working class movements of resistance, uneven development, and the declining rate of profit. Economic crisis identifies moments in time and space where the logic and practice of capital accumulation becomes unsustainable; it is when the “contradictions of capitalism” reach structural limits that require action by the state or by capitalists collectively to manage, transform, or repress those contradictions. These events are often signaled through depressions or by social movements such as strikes, boycotts, and direct action.

First, economic crises are often identified with inflation and recession, when the cost of goods and services rise to a point where it affects consumption (Solimano 2020). A decrease in the ability of most people to purchase goods and services is described as poverty or deprivation, but from the perspective of a ruling class, it is also a problem because it slows or stops the circulation of products. A certain wage level is necessary to allow the working class to consume the goods it produces. When wages fall below the socially necessary level required to reproduce the working class, it generates an economic crisis of underconsumption.

Second, a tendency for the rate of profit to fall has also been identified as a structural contradiction within capitalist economies, where the ratio of profit made on invested capital decreases over time, undermining the incentive of capitalists to invest and thus undermining the growth promised by private ownership of the means of production (Weisskopf 1979). Although some economists have challenged whether the tendency for the rate of profit to fall is an “economic law” of capitalism (Ortlieb 2014), it has been

observed historically that a periodic “profit squeeze” triggers “capital strikes” among capitalists, who refuse to invest capital when rates of profits fall below an acceptable level (Glyn and Sutcliffe 1972). The first and most significant response by capitalists to a profit squeeze is to drive down wages, a task which has been undertaken over time and *en masse* by a failure to keep up with “cost of living” increases. This intensifies exploitation by extracting more value from workers and redistributing it to the owners and managers of capital, but this short-term tactic can simultaneously undermine the legitimacy of the state’s political leadership and, thereby, intensify the crisis as a result of mass resistance movements. Marxist economists have suggested that such crises generate a growth in the “surplus population” domestically (Benanov and Clegg 2010), while leading to imperialist expansion (Luxemburg 2015) that generates globally uneven development (Amin 1974; Mandel 1999).

Crisis is both an objective and subjective historical process that requires a careful analysis of the relations of production as they exist in different sectors, as well as attention to strategies of solidarity and mass organizing for change. In the history of political economy, the separation of the political and economic disciplines evolved with a growing acceptance of an ideology that sees capital accumulation as not only embedded in the nature of humans but also subject to universal, coherent, objective laws. This idea has supported a tendency to see the capitalist economy as unchangeable, eternal, and not in any way subject to change in its fundamental structure, which is assumed to be generally in equilibrium even amidst massive economic, social, and political inequalities.

The sources of economic crises, therefore, can be understood as emanating from the structure of relationships under a system of capitalist accumulation. This structural explanation helps to uncover important dynamics that approach “objectivity” in the economic laws of capitalism, but it is also true that economic crises are brought about by historical blocs of social movement activity (Wright 1985; Linera 2006). In this sense, subjects/agents resist exploitation, question the individualist and competitive conception of work which allows owners and managers to capture surplus value through working class solidarity and organization, and intervene to

consciously attempt to change the economic, social, political, and cultural systems at work.

One approach to economic crises emphasizes the disjuncture between the ideology of capital accumulation and the tendency of the rate of profit to fall under capitalism, which is often considered to be a fundamental contradiction grasped through the method of dialectical materialism. Under capitalist systems the drive to accumulate is both expected and reinforced because capital is seen as the source of all value. The people that own capital are legally entitled and expected to invest that capital to produce more value; their instrumentally rational self-interest will contribute to the growth of the economy and increase the wealth of nation-states. In that sense, the ideology of capitalist accumulation views society as a collection of individuals pursuing profit maximization for themselves and this inevitably produces economic inequality that is ostensibly based on individual hard work, prudence, and skill. Decisions about who gets what and why are left to “the market,” which rewards individual owners with increasing returns on their ownership. When profits instead go down over time, it reveals the fundamentally social character of the economy.

As a social logic and practice, capitalist economic relations have developed a logic of economic accumulation that is unsustainable and leads to crisis situations. Along with the development of productive forces through technologies and rationalized structures, we can see classes develop as individual relationships to productive processes evolve; individuals who own capital often see a world of infinite possibility of economic gain and so become driven to increase the profitability of their enterprises. In this social and economic logic, the drive to private accumulation has been responsible for major economic crises historically, as the expectation of continued growth and profitability is undermined by the structures of work designed to increase productivity, a fact which requires one to analyse the social movements that emerge from these crises.

MINDY PEDEN

References

- Amin, Samir. 1974. *Accumulation on a World Scale*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Benanov, Aaron and John Clegg. 2010. “Misery and Debt: On the Logic and History of Surplus Populations and Surplus Capital.” *Endnotes 2* (April): 20–51.
- Glyn, Andrew and Robert B. Sutcliffe. 1972. *British Capitalism, Workers and the Profits Squeeze*. London: Penguin.
- Kotz, D.M. 1990. “A Comparative Analysis of the Theory of Regulation and the Social Structure of Accumulation Theory.” *Science and Society* 54, no. 1 (Spring): 5–28.
- Linera, Alvaro Garcia. 2006. “State Crisis and Popular Power.” *New Left Review* 37 (January/February): 73–85.
- Luxemburg, Rosa. 2015 [1913.] *The Accumulation of Capital*. Connecticut: Martino Fine Books.
- Mandel, Ernest. 1999. *Late Capitalism*. Brooklyn, NY: Verso.
- Marx, Karl. 1978 [1867]. “Capital Volume 1.” In *The Marx-Engels Reader*, edited by Robert Tucker, 2nd edn. New York: W.W. Norton and Co.
- Ortlieb, Claus Peter. 2014. “A Contradiction between Matter and Form: On the Significance of the Production of Relative Surplus Value for the Dynamics of the Final Crisis.” In *Marxism and the Critique of Value*, edited by Neil Larsen, Mathias Nilges, Josh Robinson, and Nicholas Brown, 77–122. Chicago and Alberta: MCM Publishing.
- Solimano, Andres. 2020 *A History of Big Recessions in the Long Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weisskopf, Thomas E. 1979. “Marxian Crisis Theory and the Rate of Profit in the Postwar U.S. Economy.” *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 3, no. 4 (December): 341–78.
- Wright, Erik Olin. 1985 *Class, Crisis, and the State*. Brooklyn, NY: Verso.

Further readings

- Barrow, Clyde W. 1993. *Critical Theories of the State: Marxist, Neo-Marxist, Post-Marxist*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- O'Connor, James. 1987. *The Meaning of Crisis: A Theoretical Introduction*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Simonde de Sismondi, J.C.L. 1966 [1815]. *Political Economy*. New York: Augustus M. Kelley.

See also

Samir Amin; James O'Connor; Contradiction; Theories of the State; Theories of Imperialism

77. Fiscal crisis

Fiscal crises concern the financial balance sheet of states under the system of capital accumulation. Historically, states and other social formations have been supported in their expenses through mechanisms of taxation and borrowing money (debt). Both systems of modern state finance reveal the contradictions of capital accumulation ideology as a guiding force for social formations and have become of growing concern for analysts interested in sustainable social formations. The fiscal crises of states are interconnected with crises in legitimation and motivation.

James O'Connor argues in *The Fiscal Crisis of the State* that the capitalist state has two functions which are in contradiction with each other and can be perceived in moments of fiscal crisis. The first function is to ensure economic growth and an increased profit, supporting the development of ruling class solidarity around the shared investment in capital accumulation. The other, more political function is legitimization, which involves real or perceived consent on the part of the majority of people. In this sense, welfare expenses by states function to legitimize the existing mode of production by ensuring that people do not become so exploited that they see the state as an instrument of the capitalist class. Because social value is appropriated by private profits, crises will increase in intensity, time, and place.

This draws our attention to how deeply involved in modern capitalist accumulation states and state policy have become and also concerns aspects of what can be called political capitalism which as James O'Connor has pointed out "is inexplicable in terms of conventional economic and political theory" (O'Connor 1973, 127). The interconnectedness of ideologies of capital accumulation and states invite an analysis of taxation systems and debt in general as relationships of power. Individuals, households, and companies all are subject to taxation, the articulation of which assumes and constitutes a system of

capitalist accumulation that is subject to redistributive norms but also enables norms seen as objective in the realm of production (private property) to appear as objective rather than subjective. While state expenses are seen as the purview of democratic control, to a certain extent the drivers of revenue inputs into the state have developed a scientization along with the logic of accumulation. Broadly conceived, tax systems in governance both reflect and constitute understandings about the relationship between people and between people and the state. Taxes are levied by states at different levels and using a wide variety of principles and practices. The assumption that states collect revenue in order to fund their expenses, though, is only partially historically accurate. It is well established that the fiscal policies of states also enmesh with accumulation goals, moral theory, and can be crucial to state legitimacy.

States have also borrowed money from other states, international organizations, banks, and individuals, known as debt financing. The extension of relationships of debtors/creditors to all aspects of societies was driven by attachment to a model of the stages of capitalist development that encouraged structural adjustment programs as a condition of loans (including austerity measures which very directly encourage social formations of domination and erode democratic control). For instance, analysts can understand the power dynamics of the debt relationship and what is at stake politically by studying the history of Haitian debt after independence from France, a material history of powerful contradictions that are both a displacement and an example of the fundamental tension around domination, played at the level of state legitimacy and recognition in a fundamentally social world distorted by practices of exploitation and domination.

MINDY PEDEN

References

O'Connor, James. 1973. *The Fiscal Crisis of the State*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

78. Legitimation crisis

In any social formation there may be legitimation crises in the sense that people will resist authority and domination in a myriad of ways, but the concept is developed in this entry as it is formulated by Jürgen Habermas, and his student Claus Offe, who link legitimation crises to the capital accumulation process. The fundamental contradiction of the capitalist state is located in the legal separation of economic decision-making (i.e., private property) from political authority (i.e., democracy) in capitalist societies. This means that the state has no authority to order production or to control it; the state cannot command economic performance, but only induce investment and employment by offering incentives to those who control productive assets (Offe 1974, 1975, 1984).

However, in a political democracy, a capitalist state must also be legitimate and the state's legitimacy is dependent on its ability to deliver prosperity to ordinary citizens in the form of employment, wage growth, and social welfare entitlements, which contradict the imperatives of private capital accumulation (e.g., strong unions, living wage, progressive taxation). Thus, according to Offe, a capitalist state which sustains an exploitative accumulation process can only achieve and maintain legitimacy by deploying concealment and ideological mechanisms. The state's ideological mechanisms convey the image that its power is organized to pursue the general interests of society as a whole, even though it functions in a specific relationship to capitalist accumulation. Consequently, a capitalist state must sustain and yet conceal the structural disjuncture between its democratic form and its capitalist functions.

Insofar as political legitimacy is entangled with the capitalist accumulation process, political technologies and administrative rationality have reproduced the form and function of depoliticizing production in general. While politics is about distribution and retribution and is therefore under the purview of political intervention, the widespread ideological assumption is that the processes of production are not subject to political power and are the entitlement of the individuals who own the means of production (O'Connor 1978; Bowles and Gintis 1986; Barrow 1993, 107–09). Insofar as such ideas

reproduce a subjectivity that elevates competitive, purposively rational orientations and commodification, it forms the basis of what could be called ruling class ideology that legitimates its control over the production of values.

As the majority of people struggle for and win basic rights through social movements, organization, and solidarity, a sense of political efficacy can also develop that reveals the limitations of what can be called bourgeois rights or citizenship. Legitimation crises happen when the concealed mechanisms of exploitation and ruling class domination become visible and reveal that a small number of people control decisions about our collective future. According to Habermas's (1973, 26) interpretation of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, conflicts over legitimation can be understood "only with reference to the operatively effective rules according to which incompatible claims or intentions are produced within an action system." The long-term incompatibility between claims is not visible because of the structure of communication (propaganda and ideology), but when they become so in moments of crisis they can be recognized as antagonistic interests between labor and capital and between citizens and the state.

However, in mainstream political science, the antagonism between accumulation (capitalism) and legitimation (democracy) is not conceptualized as a structural contradiction, but only as "failures of leadership; weaknesses in crisis management systems; 'ungovernability' and 'excessive democracy'; the inability of political party systems to channel and control social conflict; and dangerous fault lines in the international political system, especially the revival of revolutionary civil wars in the Third World and the restoration of the early arms race" (O'Connor 1987, 16; Crozier et al. 1975). Thus, to the extent that legitimation crises are managed and administered from above as mere failures of individual or party leadership, they will continue to deepen and appear more frequently and intensely in capitalist societies. In this respect, the political culture of depoliticized democracy under capitalism encourages both action and passivity, leading to what is termed a motivation crisis. The crisis of legitimation can temporarily resolve by reinforcing class domination (e.g., authoritarian statism) or it can be an opportunity to

expand democratic control over production of social value.

MINDY PEDEN

References

- Barrow, Clyde W. 1993. *Critical Theories of the State: Marxist, Neo-Marxist, Post-Marxist*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis. 1986. *Democracy and Capitalism: Property, Community, and the Contradictions of Modern Social Thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- Crozier, Michael J., Samuel P. Huntington, and Johi Watanuki, eds. 1975. *The Crisis of Democracy*. New York: New York University Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1973. *Legitimation Crisis*, translated by Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press.
- O'Connor, James. 1978. *The Fiscal Crisis of the State*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- O'Connor, James. 1987. *The Meaning of Crisis: A Theoretical Introduction*. New York: Blackwell.
- Offe, Claus. 1974. "Structural Problems of the Capitalist State: Class Rule and the Political System. On the Selectiveness of Political Institutions." In *German Political Studies*, Vol. 1, edited by Klaus von Beyme, 31–57. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Offe, Claus. 1975. "The Theory of the Capitalist State and the Problem of Policy Formation." In *Stress and Contradiction in Modern Capitalism*, edited by Leon Lindberg, 125–44. Lexington, MA, D.C. Heath.
- Offe, Claus. 1984. *Contradictions of the Welfare State*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.

Further readings

- Connolly, William, ed. 1984. *Legitimacy and the State*. New York: New York University Press.

See also

- Economic Crisis; Rationality Crisis; Motivation Crisis; Theories of the State

79. Motivation crisis

The concept of a motivation crisis in capitalism was first articulated by Jürgen Habermas in his book *Legitimation Crisis* (1975). In this work, Habermas articulated one of the most comprehensive and analytically coherent typologies of potential crisis conditions in late capitalist systems. Habermas (1975, 2) observes that “crises arise when the structure of a social system allows fewer possibilities for problem solving than are necessary to the continued existence of the [capitalist] system.” The difference between a crisis and a mere problem is that crises ultimately cannot be resolved within the capitalist system’s boundaries because they are generated by internal systemic imperatives that are mutually incompatible, that is, a contradiction in the Marxian sense of the term (see Offe 1984, 132).

Habermas suggests that crises of capitalism may be generated from within the economic, political, or socialization subsystems. He argues that the underlying economic crisis of capitalism, evident since the Great Depression of the 1930s, has been largely displaced into the state through state-capitalist welfare and regulatory policies (see O’Connor 1978). Thus, the underlying economic crisis tendencies of capitalism are now more likely to culminate in a fiscal crisis of the state than in a full-scale economic collapse on the magnitude of the Great Depression. Similarly, the contradictory tension between the state functions of capital accumulation and political legitimation manifest as two additional crisis tendencies within the political system. First, opportunistic social policies, along with the disintegration of the state apparatuses in late capitalism, suggests the possibility of a rationality crisis where the state apparatus is increasingly unable to generate the requisite system outputs in the form of economic growth (i.e., accumulation crisis). Second, a legitimation crisis occurs when the state can no longer create normative loyalties among the mass population by concealing its capitalist functions with administrative secrecy and democratic symbolism. Finally, “output deficits” in the economic and political subsystems become input deficits for the socialization system in the form of declining resources and symbols. Consequently, a motivation crisis may manifest itself in peoples’ unwillingness

to participate in capitalist labor markets or to accept the policy boundaries imposed by the capitalist relations of production.

The logical outcome of fiscal and rationality crises would seem to be an implosion of the welfare state. The welfare state will either fail to satisfy the requirements of capital accumulation or its legitimacy will be jeopardized by the austerity policies and political repression necessary to maintain capital accumulation. However, these output deficits of the economic and political subsystems generate cultural contradictions in the socialization subsystem in the form of decreasing labor market participation (see Bell 1976). Habermas suggests that as market relations expand throughout a society, these relations subsume traditional or natural bonds such as family, church, and apprenticeship, which are increasingly ruptured by individualized labor market competition. These cultural gaps are filled historically by state institutions such as schools, family support programs, and cultural policies. Thus, output deficits in the economic and political subsystems may lead to input deficits to the socialization subsystem due to an insufficient allocation of resources and services to the socialization subsystem. Consequently, the crisis feedback loop is closed and cumulatively exacerbated as the socialization subsystem (e.g., schools and family) turns out insufficiently skilled workers that are also unhealthy, unmotivated, and anomic.

On the other hand, when the administrative distribution of economic inputs is sufficient to reproduce capitalist relations of production, the welfare state tends to generate value changes in the population that result in motivational output deficits. First, the welfare state’s redistributive policies detach income from direct labor market participation as illustrated by the U.S. Government’s COVID-19 pandemic payments or as proposed in Universal Basic Income plans (Mulligan and Antoni 2022). For example, it is estimated that since the COVID-19 pandemic approximately seven million prime age men (ages 25–54) have chosen to simply “clock out” of the American workforce despite millions of job openings (Louis 2023). Second, the political allocation of economic values creates new distribution-based entitlement groupings, such as students, pensioners, and social welfare recipients, as opposed to production-based classes. Thus, state social

expenditures facilitate the emergence of new economic groups with cultural identities that are detached from labor market participation and economic productiveness, with the result that an “entitlement mentality” replaces the work ethic (Offe 1972; Boggs 1986). This cultural output deficit can be observed sociologically in the emergence of individuals who are increasingly motivated by the non-workplace centered and non-productivist normative values of a postmaterialist culture (Gorz 1989, Chaps. 8–9; Inglehart 1977; LaFargue 1999).

CLYDE W. BARROW

References

- Barrow, Clyde W. 1993. *Critical Theories of the State: Marxist, Neo-Marxist, Post-Marxist*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Bell, Daniel. 1976. *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*. New York: Basic Books.
- Boggs, Carl. 1986. *Social Movements and Political Power: Emerging Forms of Radicalism in the West*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Gorz, Andre. 1989. *Critique of Economic Reason*. London: Verso.
- Inglehart, Ronald. 1977. *The Silent Revolution: Changing Values and Political Styles Among Western Publics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- LaFargue, Paul. 1999. *The Right to Be Lazy*. Translated by Len Bracken. Ardmore, PA: Fifth Season Press.
- Louis, Serah. 2023. “The Most Chilling Metric of All.” *Moneywise*, March 19. Available at ‘The most chilling metric of all’: Mike Rowe warns that 7 million American men are ‘done’ looking for work and have ‘punched out’ — why that’s a serious problem (yahoo.com).
- Mulligan, Casey and E.J. Antoni. 2022. *Paying Americans Not to Work*. Washington, D.C.: Committee to Unleash Prosperity, 2022. Accessed December 24, 2022 at Microsoft Word - Paying Americans Not to Work.docx (committeetounleashprosperity.com).
- O’Connor, James. 1978. *The Fiscal Crisis of the State*. New York: St. Martin’s Press.
- O’Connor, James. 1987. *The Meaning of Crisis: A Theoretical Introduction*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Offe, Claus. 1972. “Political Authority and Class Structures: An Analysis of Late Capitalist Societies.” *International Journal of Sociology* 2: 73–108.
- Offe, Claus. 1984. *Contradictions of the Welfare State*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.

See also

Systems-Analytic Marxism; Alienation; Jürgen Habermas

80. Rationality crisis

Jürgen Habermas (1975) has supplied the most comprehensive and analytically coherent typology of potential crisis conditions within the late capitalist system. Habermas (1975, 2) suggests that “crises arise when the structure of a social system allows fewer possibilities for problem solving than are necessary to the continued existence of the system. In this sense, crises are seen as persistent disturbances of system integration.” Importantly, the difference between a crisis and a mere problem is that crises ultimately cannot be resolved within the system’s boundaries because they are generated by systemic imperatives that are mutually incompatible, that is, contradictory in the Marxian sense of the term.

Habermas suggests that crises of capitalism may be generated potentially from within any of its three subsystems, which include the economic, political, and socialization subsystems. However, contemporary crisis theorists tend to agree that the underlying economic crisis of capitalism has been largely displaced into the state through state-capitalist and welfare policies (O’Connor 1987). This means that the fundamental contradiction of liberal-democratic states in capitalist societies is located in the legal separation of economic decision-making (i.e., private property) from political authority (i.e., democracy). The state has no authority to order production or to control it. Thus, the state cannot command economic performance; it can only induce investment and employment by offering incentives to those who control productive assets (Offe 1974, 1975, 1984). However, in a political democracy, a capitalist state must also be legitimate and the state’s legitimacy is dependent on its ability to deliver prosperity to ordinary citizens in the form of employment, wage growth, and social welfare entitlements, which contradict incentives for private capital accumulation (e.g., strong unions, living wage, progressive taxation).

Habermas, Offe, and O’Connor each suggest in various ways that surmounting the contradiction between accumulation and legitimation is obstructed by systemic limitations on state rationality. First, Offe points out that state elites are not the beneficiaries of marginal cost curves which allow them to

rationally calculate optimal expenditures on social capital (i.e., physical infrastructure, workforce training, R&D, etc.). Therefore, it is conceivable that a state might produce more social capital than is necessary to support capital accumulation at which point the “surplus” social capital outlays become excess social expenses. A state might also under-allocate investments in social capital in which case it would fail to support capital accumulation at optimum levels. Yet, these “rationality deficits” only become evident after the fact when their effects become visible as an economic or fiscal crisis (Offe 1973, 114–15).

However, as Habermas (1975, 46) observes these functional:

output crises have the form of a *rationality* crisis in which the administrative system does not succeed in reconciling and fulfilling the imperatives received from the economic system ... The rationality crisis is a displaced systemic crisis which, like economic crisis, expresses the contradiction between socialized production for non-generalizable interests and steering imperatives. This crisis tendency is converted into the withdrawal of legitimation by way of a disorganization of the state apparatus.

Second, Offe and Habermas have each suggested that efforts by state elites and state managers to surmount the political contradiction between accumulation and legitimation are hindered by real systemic limitations on state rationality. In modern states, the legitimacy of state policy inheres in formal rules and procedures whose observation by political authorities obligates citizens to comply with the state’s laws and decisions. However, Offe makes the important observation that the legitimating status of formal rules and procedures is linked to an assumption that their application and observation by state officials will systematically result in functional consequences that contribute to the common and individual welfare. Thus, while the formal legitimacy of bureaucratic procedures is based on strict adherence to bureaucratic rules and consistent enforcement of those rules, over the long-term their substantive legitimacy resides in our common expectation that these rules are functionally effective in achieving an identified outcome, whether that outcome is new job creation, environ-

mental protection, a fair trial, or student learning.

Thus, the rationality crisis faced by state managers is that they must simultaneously balance two competing forms of rationality: (1) a formal rationality that inheres in the strict observation of formal-bureaucratic procedure and (2) substantive rationality that inheres in functional effectiveness (Marcuse 1965). The ability to balance these two forms of rationality requires that means and ends be aligned with each other, but to the extent that the two forms of rationality diverge, state managers must choose between short-term formal legitimacy based on appeals to position and authority or substantive legitimacy based in the long-term functional effectiveness of their decisions and administrative practices.

Offe and Habermas suggest that the two forms of rationality are diverging as a systemic effect of capitalist development and this divergence leads to a dichotomy in state administrative practices and decision-making processes. The result is a type of state administration that constantly oscillates between the two horns of this dilemma, but which does not resolve the contradiction itself. Moreover, state managers cannot resolve the contradiction within current systemic constraints, because the wholesale pursuit of either strategy risks a legitimation deficit or substantive failure (Offe 1985, 303–07; Habermas 1975, 47). Both outcomes have the potential to implode the administrative system and generate popular upheavals demanding a new system of relationships that restore democratic accountability and functional effectiveness to the failed state administrative system. The other alternative is for state elites to relieve pressure on the state administrative system by shrinking its boundaries and withdrawing from public functions through privatization, marketization, and commodification policies, which ostensibly “de-politicize” these social relations by transferring them back to markets and the private sector (Offe 1996).

These contradictory pressures in state administration are now generating a form of decision-making that Barrow (2010) calls *fictitious rationality*. Fictitious rationality is a derivative of formal rationality, which as Herbert Marcuse (1968, 201–26) observed more than a half-century ago, focuses exclusively on administrative *means*, such as rules,

procedures, and efficiency calculations. Substantive rationality focuses on *ends* and it is therefore evaluative, normative, and even political. It asks whether an administrative process achieves its purpose, however narrowly or broadly conceived, and even questions whether that purpose is worthwhile or in the best interests of those who are the objects of formal rationality. Consequently, an administrative process based exclusively in formal rationality does not incorporate the *substantive reasons* for its existence or understand the normative purposes it serves as an instrumentality. Thus, when the failure of formal rationality is challenged by substantive rationality, its adherents solipsistically justify the need for *more* formal rationality with redundant appeals to the need for more rules, more process, greater efficiency, and more productivity without questioning why there is a crisis in the first place and the end result is authoritarian statism. Marcuse (1965, 6) observes that the climax of formal rationality in late capitalism occurs when this rationality appears “in a new light – in the light of its [substantive] irrationality.” Formal rationality becomes fictitious rationality when it is divorced from social or organizational ends and no longer subjects itself to the evaluative requirement that it be functionally effective.

CLYDE W. BARROW

References

- Barrow, Clyde W. 2010. “The Rationality Crisis in U.S. Higher Education.” *New Political Science* 32, no. 3 (September): 317–44.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1975. *Legitimation Crisis*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Marcuse, Herbert. 1965. “Industrialization and Capitalism.” *New Left Review* 30 (March/April 1965): 3–17.
- Marcuse, Herbert. 1968. *Negations: Essays in Critical Theory*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- O'Connor, Jim. 1973. “Summary of the Theory of the Fiscal Crisis.” *Kapitalistate* 1: 79–83.
- O'Connor, James. 1987. *The Meaning of Crisis: A Theoretical Introduction*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Offe, Claus. 1973. “The Abolition of Market Control and the Problem of Legitimacy (1).” *Kapitalistate* 1: 109–16.
- Offe, Claus. 1974. “Structural Problems of the Capitalist State: Class Rule and the Political System. On the Selectiveness of Political Institutions.” In *German Political Studies*, Vol. 1, edited by Klaus von Beyme, 31–57. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Offe, Claus. 1975. "The Theory of the Capitalist State and the Problem of Policy Formation." In *Stress and Contradiction in Modern Capitalism*, edited by Leon Lindberg, 125–44. Lexington, MA, D.C. Heath.

Offe, Claus. 1984. *Contradictions of the Welfare State*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.

Offe, Claus. 1985. *Disorganized Capitalism*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.

Offe, Claus. 1996. *Modernity and the State*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.

See also

Systems-Analytic Marxism; Jürgen Habermas; Herbert Marcuse; Theories of the State

81. Cultural imperialism

Cultural imperialism is the imposition of a foreign culture onto a subject society by a politically and/or economically dominant society. Cultural imperialism involves the often, though not always, forceful imposition of the customs, traditions, religion, language, social, and moral norms of one society onto another as distinct from the imposition of economic and political dominance, although the various forms of imperialism usually constitute an interrelated matrix of domination. The recognition of this relationship culture and empire originated with Edward Said in the mid-1980s. Said's concept of cultural imperialism was an effort to describe "a more general pattern of relationships between the modern metropolitan West and its overseas territories" (Said 1993, xi). References made to local customs, traditions, religion, language, social and moral norms are features of a way of life of any specific culture. Imperialism suggests the imposition of these cultural norms on another society by forcefully exerting authority and imposing its way of life on another population. Thus, cultural imperialism usually refers to the forced acculturation of a subject population (Tobin 2007).

The practice of cultural imperialism begins with political and/or economic imperialism. Political imperialism is typically accomplished by "coercion, control over natural resources, and propaganda," while economic imperialism occurs when the flow of money into one country is controlled by another. Bernd Hamm (2005, 24–5) cites Susantha Goonatilake's definition of "an imposition of a cultural package against the informed will of the recipients" in suggesting that "capitalism is the most aggressive of cultural imperialists."

Throughout history, cultural imperialism has largely been achieved by military intervention and conquest. The Roman Empire is an early example of territorial and cultural expansion in the development of Western civilization. The assimilation of numerous tribes and nations into Roman-Greco culture – including Roman law, the Latin language, architecture styles, literature, and religion – occurred in the period known as Pax Romana. In serving as a prime instrument of colonization, cultural imperialism extends the author-

ity of one nation outside its own boundaries to expand economic domination over another's labor force and resources. While colonization was mostly initiated by military conquest, its wider effects implemented through law, education, and military force are designed to impose what is considered by the imperialists a "superior" way of life on a subject population. Seeking to purge local populations of allegedly barbaric, uncivilized customs and mores, colonizers mitigate resistance by eradicating much of the former way of life of those who are being colonized (Tobin 2007).

The colonization of the Aztec empire by Spain in the sixteenth century enabled the suppression of Mesoamerican culture. Indigenous people were prevented from learning their traditional values and beliefs but were, in some cases forced, to read and write Spanish and convert to Christianity. The adoption of the cultural norms of the oppressor was a widespread trait of colonization. The British influence in India and the Dutch and French presence in the Caribbean are prime examples of cultural imperialism. The modern legacy of cultural imperialism is often associated with the historical experience of colonization and imperialism (Tobin 2007).

In the post-World War II era, cultural imperialism extended beyond violent conflict and military intervention. Political and economic influence became important strategies for establishing global dominance and power. Cultural imperialist critiques surfaced during the Cold War in response to the growing influence of the United States around the world. In the aftermath of the Second World War, the ideological competition between the United States and the Soviet Union created a bipolar international system as other countries were forced to pledge all allegiance to one respective socioeconomic system or the other (Garcia and Birkinbine 2019).

Both Russia and the United States derived a great deal of power from less powerful countries under their control. During the Soviet era, Russia forcefully imposed communism throughout most of Northern Eurasia and implemented "Russianization" and "Russification" programs. At the same time, the "Americanization" of other cultures has been described as a form of "economic imperial control" (Tobin 2017, 537) as the increasing demand for American goods and services is generated by extreme marketing

and propaganda to foreign populations. This has been successful insofar as the United States has “managed to implant into the brains of perhaps a majority of human beings a self-portrait of a brave hero fighting fiercely for freedom, democracy, social justice” (Hamm 2005, 20). The mass exportation of American films, music, clothing, and food into other countries is a form of cultural imperialism that threatens to extinguish the traditional way of life in other countries. Some have reacted with legal forms of resistance. For instance, during the 1950s, “France attempted to ban the sale of Coca-Cola and more recently McDonald’s,” while Canada requires that at least 35 percent of popular music broadcast each week in that country must be Canadian content (Tobin 2007, 537). Today, issues of cultural imperialism arise most commonly in the context of international business.

STACY MADDERN

References

- García, Rodrigo Gómez and Benjamin Birkinbine. 2019. “Cultural Imperialism Theories.” *Special Issue: Revisiting the Communications Commons for The International Journal of Media and Culture*.
- Hamm, Bernd. 2005. “Cultural Imperialism: The Political Economy of Cultural Domination.” In *Cultural Imperialism: Essays on the Political Economy of Cultural Domination*, edited by Bernd Hamm and Russell Smandych, 18–30. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Said, Edward W. 1993. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage.
- Tobin, Theresa. 2007. “Cultural Imperialism.” In *Philosophy Faculty Research and Publications*, 343. Marquette University. Available at https://epublications.marquette.edu/phil_fac/343.

See also

Theories of Imperialism; Domination; Ruling Class

Section II: Debt

82. Private debt

Private debt is a matter of growing concern, both socially and politically. In particular, private debt has grown fifteenfold over the past 80 years (Gonzalez 2021). Thus, Americans today are far more indebted than their parents and grandparents, even when we account for inflation. This is in addition to the ever-growing economic adversity plaguing Americans on a daily basis (Rehm et al. 2012; Hacker et al. 2013; Mettler 2014). With private debt growing out of control, it is imperative that scholars, and by extension political scientists, learn about what effect debt may have on the average citizen.

The history of debt, though seemingly economic in nature, has political roots. Louis Hyman (2011; 2012) notes that for the first half of its history, the US government did little to nothing to spur a fledgling creditor industry. Things changed roughly a hundred years ago. Since then, however, the federal government has partnered with creditors to increase credit access for all Americans. Credit has allowed many Americans to purchase goods they may not otherwise have access to on a cash basis. However, people today find themselves in far greater debt, and paying more on it than ever before, causing many to struggle with paying their bills (Frank 2007). In response, many social movements have appeared, most notably *Occupy Wall Street* and *We are the 99 Percent* in 2012, which have drawn attention to inequality, debt, and adversity in the US and globally (Graeber 2012).

Today, given the prevalence of debt, scholars have turned their attention to what effects it has on people. Several social effects have been identified by scholars. Notably, more indebted individuals suffer from greater mental health and depression-related problems than do those with less debt (Gathergood 2012; Sweet 2018). Crime is also much more common in communities where the average person has more debt than those where people average lower debt (McIntyre 2017). Even workplace satisfaction was greater among less indebted people than more indebted ones (Kim and Garman 2004). As women, people of color, and the elderly are more likely to have debt, it is likely these effects disproportionately affect certain groups of people more than they do others (Lusardi 2012; Dunn and Mirzaie 2015).

However, the political effects of debt are less obvious. The only concrete study to examine the relationship between private debt and politics was one that looked at online activity and debt (Deville 2016). The author found that those who suffered from higher debt were more likely to be involved in political activity online. Specifically, people with more debt were more frequently involved in online discussions of debt, more likely to join groups that supported those with more debt, and more likely to engage on collective political action on the matter. However, it was the only such study of its kind that I found.

More recently, Gonzalez (2021) identified several major forms of private debt. These include mortgage, credit card, college loan, medical loan, and miscellaneous forms of debt. Through all debt, Gonzalez theorized that the effects of debt would in general lead to reduced trust in government, lessened political participation, and greater support for socioeconomic policy. In most cases, however, he found that most forms of debt did not influence peoples' political behavior. The only form of debt that had some consistent effect on political behavior was student loan/college debt. More college debt negatively affected donations to social causes, while mildly increasing support for college loan forgiveness programs. Thus, though college debt may be unique as a form of debt in its effect on the political behavior of people, more research (and possibly new measures) will be necessary for a better understanding of its political effects.

To conclude, private debt has a history based in politics. Today, debt is pervasive and it affects peoples' lives and behavior. Its effects on political behavior, however, is less clear. With college debt, there appears to be more of an effect. With other forms, there is less, if any, effect on political behavior. This suggests that we should not treat all forms of private debt the same. In addition, two things must come about at the societal level if we hope to reduce debt. First, government should play a larger role in ensuring people only have access to the debt they absolutely need, and that they do not feel tempted to take on debt they do not need. Second, greater financial education at the primary and secondary education levels will ensure people will be smarter in how they spend and borrow money. Altogether, the three changes mentioned here will not only inform scholars

of the differences between the many forms of debt, but also bring about wiser use of debt whenever people must borrow money.

G. ANDREW GONZALEZ

References

- Denville, Joe. 2016. "Debtor Politics: Tracking the Participatory Politics of Consumer Credit." *Consumption Markets & Culture* 19, no. 1: 38–55.
- Dunn, Lucia F. and Ida A. Mirzaie. 2015. "Consumer Debt Stress, Changes in Household Debt, and the Great Recession." *Economic Inquiry* 54, no. 1: 201–14.
- Frank, Robert H. 2007. *Falling Behind: How Rising Inequality Harms the Middle Class*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gathergood, John. 2012. "Debt and Depression: Causal Links and Social Norm Effects." *The Economic Journal* 122: 1094–114.
- Gonzalez, Giancarlo Andrew. 2021. *Indebted: American Private Debt and Its Political Consequences*. PhD diss. Knoxville, Tennessee: University of Tennessee.
- Graeber, David. 2012. "Can Debt Spark a Revolution?" *The Nation*. <https://www.thenation.com/article/can-debt-spark-revolution/>.
- Hacker, Jacob S., Philipp Rehm, and Mark Schlesinger. 2013. "The Insecure American: Economic Experiences, Financial Worries, and Policy Attitudes." *Perspectives on Politics* 11, no. 1: 23–49.
- Hyman, Louis. 2011. *Debtor Nation: The History of America in Red Ink*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hyman, Louis. 2012. "The Politics of Consumer Debt: U.S. State Policy and the Rise of Investment in Consumer Credit, 1920–2008." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 644: 40–49.
- Kim, Jinhee and E. Thomas Garman. 2004. "Financial Stress, Pay Satisfaction and Workplace Performance." *Compensation & Benefits Review* (January/February): 69–76.
- Lusardi, Annamaria. 2012. "Financial Literacy and Financial Decision-Making in Older Adults." *Journal of the American Society on Aging* 36, no. 2: 25–32.
- McIntyre, Stuart G. 2017. "Personal Indebtedness, Community Characteristics, and Theft Crimes." *Urban Studies* 54, no. 10: 2395–419.
- Mettler, Suzanne. 2014. *Degrees of Inequality: How the Politics of Higher Education Sabotaged the American Dream*. New York: Basic Books.
- Rehm, Philipp, Jacob S. Hacker, and Mark Schlesinger. 2012. "Insecure Alliances: Risk, Inequality, and Support for the Welfare State." *The American Political Science Review* 106, no. 2: 386–406.
- Sweet, Elizabeth. 2018. "'Like You Failed at Life': Debt, Health, and Neoliberal Subjectivity." *Social Science & Medicine* 212: 86–93.

Further readings

- Bartels, Larry M. 2008; 2016. *Unequal Democracy: The Political Economy of the New Gilded Age*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Levine, Adam S. 2015. *American Insecurity: Why Our Economic Fears Lead to Political Inaction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Whalen, R. Christopher. 2011. *Inflated: How Money and Debt Built the American Dream*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley and Sons.

83. Public debt

Public debt at first glance seems to be a type of debt like any other debt, except for the fact that it is owed by a government body to a nongovernmental creditor. Public debt is thus an outstanding financial obligation that a state owes to a non-state creditor, which expects to be repaid with interest over a fixed period of time. This concept of debt reveals it to be a social relation between debtors and creditors, where the parties appear as equals in a social equilibrium established by contract. However, the state is not a party like any other debtor. Public debt differs from most kinds of debt, where a specific creditor has a claim over a specific debtor (Carruthers 2005), because the state is a class mediator (Therborn 2008 [1978]) and, thus, cannot be considered the actual debtor. Rather, it is taxpayers who are expected to provide the funds necessary to repay the debt. Furthermore, the state is such a long-lasting and quasi-immortal entity that it can borrow indefinitely. This concept also defines public debt as it is recorded in government accounts, restricted to its empirical aspects, such as loan size, duration, interest rate, and so on.

In his theory of the rate of interest, John Maynard Keynes (1964 [1936]) provides a more abstract and thus more encompassing concept of debt by distinguishing between money and debt. According to Keynes, money is the immediate command over generalized purchasing power, which can be exchanged for a debt that then becomes an instrument of deferred command over a nongeneralized purchasing power. The interest rate is the reward the lender receives for parting with liquid control over the money. Keynes emphasizes individual rationality, where the interest rate is a measure of one's psychological liquidity-preference. Bourdieu (2005, 83–4) would call this “theoretically minded” lender an “anthropological monster” to stress that even “rationality ... is socially structured and determined.” Although Keynes referred to debt in general (i.e., not particularly to public debt), the ideal social equilibrium left no room for political struggle.

However, political conflict can appear when public debt is perceived as an uneven social relation. Throughout most of history, the clash between the poor and the rich has chiefly taken the form of a contest between

debtors and creditors over moral concerns or material conditions related to debt (Graeber 2011). Weber's (1964 [1922]) methodological individualism did not prevent him from seeing creditors as privileged classes and debtors as disprivileged ones. Thus, one can set aside Keynes's liquidity-preference hypothesis, while keeping his definition of debt *sensu stricto*, which implies no reification of either social equilibrium or individual choice. Accordingly, public debt is the immediate command over a generalized purchasing power acquired by the state from a non-state counterparty for a specified or indefinite period of time. In exchange, the state commits to deliver to the lender, in the form of interest, a portion of surplus-value to be collected in the form of taxes. Since interest payments funded by taxpayers to satisfy the demands of creditors involves a regressive redistribution of income, public debt can become an object of class struggle.

Conflict in the fiscal realm was discussed by the classical economists, but at a level other than that of class. When they feared that public debt could “make us less thrifty” (Ricardo 1973 [1821], 163), “destroy the nation” (Hume 1987 [1777], 361), or result in a “destruction of some capital” (Smith 2003 [1776], 1178), the classical economists envisioned a social divide where productive individuals were overburdened by prodigal statesmen who wielded power through unproductive states. For Marx, the social divide expressed in public debt was quite different. The fact that public debt does not rely on direct labor exploitation makes it a special type of class relation that is established by means and mediation of the state. Along with the original exploitation of workers, which takes place in the process of production, workers suffer a secondary exploitation that can take on forms such as mortgages, usury, or taxes on the means of subsistence (Marx 1960 [1850]; 1991 [1894]).

Here one can see that the same relation that is an object of class struggle serves as a means to defer political conflict. In borrowing, government garners extraordinary resources without taxpayers sensing this immediately (Marx 1990 [1890]). Yet, taxes, like interest, profits, and rents are forms that surplus-value takes during the circulation of capital. Since value is produced by labor, workers bear the entire, actual tax burden. Furthermore, insofar as loans taken in the

present can lead the state to increase taxation to service this debt, one of the potential consequences of borrowing is the expansion of future labor exploitation. This will occur precisely through the real interest paid by the state. This configuration makes the financial system, its agents and mechanisms, as well as the state, all organic to the entire process of capital accumulation.

Public debt is one such financial mechanism, which establishes a special class relation between workers as the actual debtors and the owners of interest-bearing capital loaned to the state. Depending upon the dimensions of either outstanding debt or the interest rate, this indebtedness-taxation nexus can change the rate of labor exploitation. When neoliberalism replaced Keynesian liberalism, one of the first shocks it imposed was to raise interest rates, which skyrocketed to curb inflation. Inflation – a sort of class-specific tax that benefits debtors over creditors (Blyth 2015) – that had sustained full employment and welfare policies then gave room to a mushrooming public debt to face the continual rising of fiscal deficits and to simulate the economy or bail it out (Hunt 2002; Streeck 2016). As a class response to the structural crisis of the 1970s, neoliberal politics favored finance in general and lenders in particular as income earners, and interest paid by the government played a pivotal role in this transfer of income (Duménil and Lévy 2011).

All we have seen here shows public debt to be a social relation of paramount relevance in time and space. When the United States increased interest rates in the late 1970s, financial capital was already circulating globally in amounts much larger than the equivalent material bases of value (Frieden 2006; Harvey 1990). In response to the increase in global liquidity, peripheral countries undertaking industrialization efforts took on foreign debt. In the 1980s, Latin-American debtor countries submitted their own economic policies to parameters dictated by the IMF and the World Bank (Marini 2011 [1991]). This kind of relation actually has a much longer history. The same loans that in the imperialist phase of accumulation diverted capital from the center to the periphery and helped political emancipation in the latter were the surest ties through which the old countries kept intervening in the

young ones (Luxemburg 2003 [1913]). This logic continues to reproduce and expand.

DANIEL BIN

References

- Blyth, Mark. 2015. *Austerity: The History of a Dangerous Idea*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 2005. "Principles of an Economic Anthropology." In *The Handbook of Economic Sociology*, edited by Neil J. Smelser and Richard Swedberg, 2nd edn, 75–89. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Carruthers, Bruce G. 2005. "The Sociology of Money and Credit." In *The Handbook of Economic Sociology*, edited by Neil J. Smelser and Richard Swedberg, 2nd edn, 355–78. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Duménil, Gérard, and Dominique Lévy. 2011. *The Crisis of Neoliberalism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Frieden, Jeffry A. 2006. *Global Capitalism: Its Fall and Rise in the Twentieth Century*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Graeber, David. 2011. *Debt: The First 5,000 Years*. Brooklyn: Melville House.
- Harvey, David. 1990. *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hume, David. 1987 [1777]. *Essays, Moral, Political, and Literary*. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund.
- Hunt, E. K. 2002. *History of Economic Thought: A Critical Perspective*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Keynes, John Maynard. 1964 [1936]. *The General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money*. San Diego, CA: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
- Luxemburg, Rosa. 2003 [1913]. *The Accumulation of Capital*. London: Routledge.
- Marini, Ruy Mauro. 2011 [1991]. "Sobre o estado na América Latina, 1991." In *Ruy Mauro Marini: vida e obra*, edited by Roberta Traspadini and João Pedro Stédile, 217–26. São Paulo: Expressão Popular.
- Marx, Karl. 1960 [1850]. *The Class Struggles in France 1848 to 1850*. Moscow: Progress.
- Marx, Karl. 1990 [1890]. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. Vol. I. London: Penguin.
- Marx, Karl. 1991 [1894]. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. Vol. III. London: Penguin.
- Ricardo, David. 1973 [1821]. *The Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*. London: Dent.
- Smith, Adam. 2003 [1776]. *The Wealth of Nations*. New York: Bantam Classic.
- Streeck, Wolfgang. 2016. *How Will Capitalism End?: Essays on a Failing System*. London: Verso.
- Therborn, Göran. 2008 [1978]. *What Does the Ruling Class Do When It Rules? State*

Apparatuses and State Power under Feudalism, Capitalism and Socialism. London: Verso.
Weber, Max. 1964 [1922]. *Economía y Sociedad: Esbozo de Sociología Comprensiva.* México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

See also

Class; Fiscal Crises of Capitalism; Exploitation; Financialization

84. Student debt

Student debt is not only a concern of public policy, but also one of political power. However, there is little discussion of student debt in mainstream political science. The lack of discussion of this problem that one finds in mainstream political science identifies student debt as an institutional or collective action problem (Eaton 2017; Mettler 2014). Such approaches illuminate the institutional framework around debt and how it might be restructured, but a critical approach should center debt itself as the object of a critical analysis. This calls forth an understanding of debt in its public, private, and generational contexts – as well as a broader theorization of governing by debt as a mode of political power.

Student debt is reported alongside credit card debt, auto loans, revolving home equity loans, and mortgages in the Household Debt and Credit report issued quarterly by the New York branch of the Federal Reserve. This includes raw totals, but also delinquency rates and demographic breakdowns by age and region (Household Debt and Credit Report 2021). The historical trend indicates that student debt is an almost always growing proportion of total household debt and, in 2010, it surpassed auto loan debt to become the second largest consumer debt sector after home mortgages. The total student loan debt as of Q2 2021 was 1.57 trillion dollars or about 11 percent of all outstanding consumer debt. Younger age brackets and lower socioeconomic status areas tend to have the highest proportion of outstanding student debt as well as the highest delinquency rates. The New York Federal Reserve began its reporting of student debt in 2005, the same year that the US Congress passed the Higher Education Reconciliation Act, which reduced interest rates and expanded eligibility for federal student loans to graduate students. Student debt was expanding prior to 2005, but the breakneck pace of student debt accretion started at the turn of the twenty-first century and was exacerbated by the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005, which made student debt mostly ineligible for discharge in bankruptcy (S.256 2005).

A critical political science should not only register this historical fact, but place student debt within the broader intellectual discourse of power and inequality, because “student debt peonage” erects high barriers to radical political action based on how it intensifies class distinctions related to affordable access to higher education (Collini 2017; Lazzarato 2015). This line of analysis by critical political science is an important prong of a critique of neoliberalism, noting that as public financial support for higher education has waned over the last four decades, students are expected to bear the brunt of that cost. Institutionally, colleges and universities must raise tuition to make up the decreasing amount of public money. The result is a vicious cycle of less public funding, which necessitates higher tuition and the accumulation of more student debt, which further discourages public bodies from investing more money because the costs are being borne by students (Debt 2014; Kirsch 2019).

This last part highlights the importance of a class analysis embedded in questions of student debt that go beyond the institutional structures and directly address class power. As is true of all debt, student debt is an asset to another party (Wray 1998). The federal government, especially after the 2005 legislation, became a ubiquitous servicer of student debt. They package the debt and sell it to investors, which makes it an interest-bearing asset. The ruling class can lay claim to the income stream of recent graduates, effectively securing a steady accumulation of surplus value, in a way that is decoupled from employment status.

There are social ramifications to this as well. Scions of the ruling class, who have their way paid, have a leg up in employment and housing markets without the added burden of student debt repayment. Furthermore, students dealing with the anxiety of student debt repayment may find themselves taking up occupations that do not fit with their personal or professional goals to service that debt (Graeber 2011). Student debt is therefore, to a critical political science, a project of class analysis and its resulting social, economic, and political inequalities, and not just an institutional consideration in making public policy. Critical political science is thus better situated to analyse student debt forgiveness and no-cost higher education movements in

their broader political contexts than mainstream political science.

ROBERT E. KIRSCH

References

- Collini, Stefan. 2017. *Speaking of Universities*. New York, NY: Verso.
- Congress.gov. "S.256 - 109th Congress (2005–2006): Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005." April 20, 2005. Available at www.congress.gov/bill/109th-congress/senate-bill/256/text.
- Debt, Strike. 2014. *The Debt Resisters' Operations Manual*. Oakland, CA: PM Press.
- Eaton, Charlie. 2017. "Still Public: State Universities and America's New Student-Debt Coalitions." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50, no. 2: 408–12.
- Graeber, David. 2011. *Debt: The First 5,000 Years*. New York: Melville House.
- "Household Debt and Credit Report - Federal Reserve Bank of New York." 2021. Accessed August 28, 2021. www.newyorkfed.org/microeconomics/hhdc.
- Kirsch, Daniel T. 2019. *Sold My Soul for a Student Loan: Higher Education and the Political Economy of the Future*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.
- Lazzarato, Maurizio. 2015. *Governing by*

Debt. Translated by Joshua David Jordan. Semiotext(e) / Intervention Series. Cambridge, MA: Semiotext(e).

- Mettler, Suzanne. 2014. *Degrees of Inequality: How the Politics of Higher Education Sabotaged the American Dream*. New York: Basic Books.
- Wray, L. Randall. 1998. *Understanding Modern Money: The Key to Full Employment and Price Stability*. New York, NY: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Further readings

- Kirsch, Daniel T. 2019. *Sold My Soul for a Student Loan: Higher Education and the Political Economy of the Future*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.
- Perna, Laura and Hillman, Nicholas. 2017. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science: Understanding Student Debt: Who Borrows, the Consequences of Borrowing, and the Implications for Federal Policy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

See also

Social Movement Analysis; Private Debt; Critical Political Economy; Exploitation

Section III: Democracy

85. Deliberative democracy

Contemporary deliberative democracy can trace its roots to the citizen assemblies of ancient Athens and Jean-Jacque Rousseau's description of a citizen assembly in *The Social Contract* (1762), through to the revival of citizen-centered democratic theory in the 1980s and 1990s (Benhabib 1996; Bohman 1996; Chambers 2003; Cohen and Rogers 1983; Dryzek 2000; Guttman and Thompson 1996; Habermas 1984; Mansbridge 1980; Young 1990). While classic deliberative assemblies were traditionally exclusionary insofar as participation in them was restricted to adult male citizens, contemporary deliberative democracy reflects a broader intellectual and social movement to make democracy more inclusive and equitable (Young 2002).

As a critical concept, deliberative democracy counterbalances the disproportionate role accorded to elected and unelected political elites in deciding policy in liberal democracies. Deliberative democracy is a close relative to participatory democracy (Pateman 1970), but deliberative democracy is unique in that it requires people to participate by engaging in deliberation, which is form of reason-centered group communication. (Habermas 1984; Niemeyer, Veri, Dryzek and Bächtiger 2023). Theoretically, the inclusion of citizen deliberation in governance should result in more representative and legitimate political decision-making (Green, Kingzette, and Neblo, 2019).

At the micro level, deliberation refers to a form of citizen group dialogue guided by specific norms such as participants educating themselves about an issue with unbiased facts, considering others' points of view, and reasoning through differences to make recommendations reflective of the group's preferences (Burkhalter, Gastil, and Kelshaw 2002; Gastil and Knobloch 2020). In a typical deliberative "mini-public," professional facilitators ensure that participants have equitable opportunities to speak and enforce ground rules to prevent domination and to empower those who feel that they are less equipped with the skills necessary to contribute to political conversations (Mansbridge, Hartz-Karp, Amengual, and Gastil 2006). While no group of volunteers is likely to be perfectly repre-

sentative, in order to ensure the contribution of a diverse range of voices, deliberative democracy advocates try as much as possible to create mini-publics in which participants are representative of people in a community. In larger citizen assemblies, which have been adopted as part of the governance process in countries like Britain, Ireland, Germany, Belgium, France, Canada, and Australia, a sortition process is used to ensure representativeness (Reuchamps, Vrydagh and Welp, 2023).

At the macro level, in deliberative systems theory, "(d)eliberative capacity does not have to be sought in any particular set of institutions (such as elections), but it can be manifested in different ways, in different systems" (Dryzek 2009, 1380; Parkinson and Mansbridge 2012); for example, in political parties (Gherghina, Soare, and Jacquet 2023).

The use and study of the concept of deliberative democracy has grown exponentially since the 1990s, within and beyond political science, in disciplines such as Communication, Psychology, Sociology, and Religious Studies (Bächtiger, Dryzek, Mansbridge, and Warren 2018). Outside of the United States, the concept has taken hold in multiple democracies as an innovation that will improve Western democratic systems to meet twenty-first-century challenges (ECPR, n.d.). Climate assemblies, which bring together citizens to make recommendations on how to mitigate climate change and achieve climate goals, seem particularly promising (Smith 2023).

Although it does not offer a radical perspective on modern democracy, instead situating change mainly within actually existing democracies, deliberative democracy presents critical challenges to traditional political science perspectives of democracy in several ways. The first challenge is to re-orient democracy around active citizen participation in governance through deliberation (Fishkin 2009; Gastil and Knobloch 2020). In this view, citizens must be involved directly in making recommendations on public issues because structures of representative democracy such as legislatures fail to fully represent the people's views for a variety of reasons, not least because of the disproportionate influence of moneyed interest groups and wealthy individuals (Schattschneider 1960). Public opinion polling cannot truly express the collective voice of the citizenry through

an aggregation of individual isolated opinions. Instead, the public must “talk together” in deliberative forums to develop collective opinions that inform policymaking (Jacobs, Cook and Delli Carpinì 2009).

The second challenge is the rejection of a model of citizenship in which the citizen is seen as an individual who maximizes self-interest mainly through the process of choosing a political party and voting for a candidate (American Political Science Association 1950; Lupia and McCubbins 1998). These models do not account for the reality that citizens live in communities about which they care deeply, and which consist of different types of people with a variety of opinions. In these communities, talk about political issues is necessary even if people try to avoid it at times. Democratic deliberation helps citizens negotiate their authentic differences in an effective and less adversarial way than other types of political participation.

The skills of effective democratic citizenship, such as the ability to understand complex policy issues and to meaningfully reflect on and incorporate the opinions of others, must be learned in the classroom and through practice, such as in participation in democratic deliberation (Cohen 2007; Strachan 2017).

The third challenge is to offer a different type of pluralism than traditional notions in Western democratic theory, one in which the self is negotiated with other selves in an ongoing conversation in a community about important values, preferred outcomes, and viable policy options (Benhabib 1996; Bohman 1996; Guttman and Thompson 1996). Deliberative democracy does not reject group politics wholesale but questions the idea that citizens should focus their attempts to influence politics on organizing in groups based on relatively fixed identities, interests, and preferences (Dahl 1998). In deliberative democracy, these aspects of the self are not fixed, and the point of deliberation is for an individual to learn new information and points of view that will continue to inform their views and preferences in collaboration with others who do the same. This reduces reliance on competition between groups to determine political outcomes, and substitutes a form of inclusion that acknowledges meaningful differences among people and attempts to correct for underrepresentation of certain groups and points of view due to historical

and contemporary discrimination and exclusion. In this way deliberative democracy provides a slow but steady path to lasting social change and helps to produce pathways in politics that prioritize the options with which most everyone can live.

STEPHANIE BURKHALTER

References

- American Political Science Association, Committee on Political Parties. 1950. “Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System.” *American Political Science Review* 44, no.3 (Part 2, supplement).
- Bächtiger, André, John Dryzek, Jane Mansbridge, and Mark E. Warren, eds. 2018. *Oxford Handbook of Deliberative Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Benhabib, Seyla. 1996. “Toward a Deliberative Model of Democratic Legitimacy.” In *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*, edited by Seyla Benhabib, 67–94. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bohman, James F. 1996. *Public Deliberation: Pluralism, Complexity, and Democracy*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Burkhalter, Stephanie, John Gastil, and Todd Kelshaw. 2002. “A Conceptual Definition and Theoretical Model of Public Deliberation in Small Face-to-Face Groups.” *Communication Theory*, 12: 398–422.
- Chambers, Simone. 2003. “Deliberative Democratic Theory.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 6: 307–26.
- Cohen, Joshua. 2007. “Deliberative Democracy.” In *Deliberation, Participation and Democracy*, edited by Shawn W. Rosenberg 219–36. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cohen, Joshua and Joel Rogers. 1983. *On Democracy: Towards a Transformation of American Society*. Middlesex, UK: Penguin.
- Dahl, Robert A. 1998. *On Democracy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Dryzek, John S. 2000. *Deliberative Democracy and Beyond: Liberals, Critics, Contestations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dryzek, John S. 2009. “Democratization as Deliberative Capacity Building.” *Comparative Political Studies* 42, no. 11: 1379–402.
- European Consortium of Political Research (ECPR). n.d. Standing Group on Democratic Innovations. <https://standinggroups.ecpr.eu/democraticinnovations/> (accessed May 7, 2023).
- Fishkin, James. 2009. *When the People Speak: Deliberative Democracy and Public Contestation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Gastil, John and Katherine Knobloch. 2020. *Hope for Democracy: How Citizens Can Bring Reason Back into Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ghergina, Sergiu, Sorina Soare, and Vincent Jacquet. 2023. "Political Parties and Deliberation: From Challenges to Opportunities." *Acta Politica* (posted online 20 March). <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41269-023-00294-7> (accessed October 24, 2023).
- Green, Jon, Johnathon Kingzette and Michael Neblo. 2019. "Deliberative Democracy and Political Decision Making." In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*, edited by William R. Thompson. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gutmann, Amy and Dennis Thompson. 1996. *Democracy and Disagreement*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1984. *Theory of Communicative Action 1. Reason and the Rationalization of Society*, translated by Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Jacobs, Lawrence R., Fay Lomax Cook, and Michael X. Delli Carpini. 2009. *Talking Together: Public Deliberation and Political Participation in America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Levine, Peter. 2007. *The Future of Democracy: Developing the Next Generation of American Citizens*. Lebanon, NH: University Press of New England.
- Lupia, Arthur and Mathew D. McCubbins. 1998. *The Democratic Dilemma: Can Citizens Learn What They Need to Know?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mansbridge, Jane J. 1980. *Beyond Adversary Democracy*. New York: Basic Books.
- Mansbridge, Jane, Janett Hartz-Karp, Michael Amengual and John Gastil. 2006. "Norms of Deliberation: An Inductive Study." *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 2, Article 7. Retrieved from www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol2/iss1/art7 (accessed October 24, 2023).
- Niemeyer, Simon, Francesco Veri, John S. Dryzek and André Bächtiger. 2023. "How Deliberation Happens: Enabling Deliberative Reason." *American Political Science Review*, 1–18. Available at [PSR_2300002 1.18](https://doi.org/10.1017/XPS.2023.1.18) (cambridge.org).
- OECD. (June 10, 2020). *Innovative Citizen Participation and New Democratic Institutions: Catching the Deliberative Wave*. <https://doi.org/10.1787/339306da-en>.
- Parkinson, John and Jane Mansbridge, eds. 2012. *Deliberative Systems: Deliberative Democracy at a Large Scale*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pateman, Carole. 1970. *Participation and Democratic Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reuchamps, Min, Julien Vrydagh and Yanina Welp, eds. 2023. *De Gruyter Handbook of Citizens' Assemblies*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. 1950 [1762]. *The Social Contract and Discourses*. New York: E.P. Dutton.
- Schattschneider, E.E. 1960. *The Semi-Sovereign People: A Realist's View of Democracy in America*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Smith, Graham. 2023. "Climate Assemblies: Emerging Trends, Challenges and Opportunities." A report of the Knowledge Network on Climate Assemblies (KNOCA). April. <https://knoca.eu/news/new-knoca-report-climate-assemblies-emerging-trends-challenges-and-opportunities/> (accessed May 8, 2023).
- Strachan, J. Cherie. 2017. "Deliberative Pedagogy's Feminist Potential: Teaching our Students to Cultivate a More Inclusive Public Sphere." In *Teaching Civic Engagement Across the Disciplines*, edited by Elizabeth C. Matto, Alison Rios Millett McCartney, Elizabeth Bennion, and Dick Simpson, 35–46. Washington, DC: American Political Science Association.
- Young, Iris Marion. 1990. *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Young, Iris Marion. 2002. *Inclusion and Democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

See also

Participatory Democracy; Jürgen Habermas

86. Digital democracy

Digital democracy denotes the ways by which social media and digital platforms engage the informed participation of the public in the political environment. Berg and Hofmann (2021) mentioned that digital democracy has both an analytical and a normative dimension, the former dealing with how the use of digital technologies may influence the political engagement and democratic governance, and the latter allowing the public to think about democracy as an open, constantly evolving political organization. In this sense, digital democracy not only addresses the rising public frustration concerning the inaccessibility and unaccountability of political figures but also promotes a transparent approach to voting that can eventually reverse declining turnout of elections in various countries. Using technology can then improve democracy through more direct and active citizen participation in public discussion and decision-making processes.

In particular, the web 2.0 democracy closely comes across with Jürgen Habermas' concept of deliberative democracy, which foregrounds the role of the public sphere for an informed and critical political discussion (Habermas 1996). Habermas' normative model of democracy created a point of reference for how we should strive for liberal democracy. It gave us an understanding of the duties of civil society, the impact of universal systems of representation and the value of communicative action. Rather than moving in this direction, we have conversely seen the rise of other systems of government, most notably those of populist, autocratic-leaning regimes and political parties. Examples include the rise of Donald Trump in the USA, UKIP and the Brexit Party in the UK, France's National Front, Austria's Freedom Party, Pauline Hanson's One Nation in Australia, and others. As a result, scholarly focus has turned toward explorations concerning the expansion of populism (Ingelhart and Norris 2016) and examinations regarding the role of digital democracy and disinformation in its growth, especially in the midst of a health pandemic with the spread of conspiracy theories (Iosifidis and Andrews 2020; Iosifidis and Nicoli 2021). But boosting democracy is key given that in the 2020 Economist's Democracy Index, only 75 of the 167 coun-

tries covered by the model, or 44.9 percent of the total, are considered to be democracies, showing that democracy has not been in robust health (The Economist 2021).

A growing body of literature is calling for a more critical investigation of the complex interaction between digital media, social media and contemporary democratic politics. Some scholars have expressed concerns that a democratic deficit has occurred with regard to a collapse in virtue and citizenship and noted that new forms of social capital are necessary to reconnect citizens with their societies (Putnam 2000). Others contend that the internet is a tool that both revolutionizes and can be used by authoritarian governments, so in the latter cases, social media sites have been used to entrench dictators and threaten dissidents, making it harder to promote democracy (Morozov 2012). Many see today's roster of information-technology giants as an index of a bigger qualitative shift taking place to "Surveillance Capitalism" (Zuboff 2019).

Today's roster of information-technology giants with their centralized control over the internet – Google, Apple, Facebook/Meta, Amazon, Microsoft, Netflix, and so on – can indeed be used as an index of a bigger qualitative shift taking place to platform capitalism. Far from the internet being a "technology of freedom," democracy has actually been in retreat worldwide for more than a decade. Given the various concerns that have arisen regarding the contribution of electronic networks to democracy, the key question to be addressed is how to promote the public sphere, citizenship, reliable news, and eventually democracy in a network society. The pace of these issues has produced some excellent research work that is being undertaken, but more ideas are needed. Politicians, policymakers, think tanks, technology providers, civil society, and academics alike are tasked to check how the use of technology in rulemaking can promote more collaborative and sustained forms of participation.

PETROS IOSIFIDIS

References

- Berg, Sebastian and Jeannette Hofmann. 2021. "Digital Democracy." *Internet Policy Review. Journal of Internet Regulation*, 10, no. 4: 1–23.

- “Democracy Index 2020: In Sickness and in Health?” 2021. *The Economist Intelligence Unit Ltd.*
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1996. *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Ingelhart, Ronald and Pippa Norris. 2016. “Trump, Brexit, and the Rise of Populism: Economic Have-nots and Cultural Backlash.” *Faculty Research Working Paper Series RWP-16.* Cambridge: Harvard Kennedy School – John Kennedy School of Government.
- Iosifidis, Petros and Leighton Andrews. 2020. “Regulating the Internet Intermediaries in a Post-truth World: Beyond Media Policy?” *International Communication Gazette* 82, no. 3: 211–30.
- Iosifidis, Petros and Nicholas Nicoli. 2021. *Digital Democracy Social Media and Disinformation.* Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Morozov, Evgeny. 2012. *The Net Delusion: The Dark Side of Internet Freedom.* New York: Public Affairs.
- Putnam, Robert D. 2000. *Bowling Alone.* New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Zuboff, Shoshana. 2019. *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power.* New York: Profile Books.

87. Economic democracy

The term “economic democracy” can be used in two different ways. The first is in a general sense having to do with various means to ensure a fair social distribution of wealth and income in society, whether through social control of the means of production or the adoption of fiscal and industrial policies. The other meaning has to do with democratic practices in economic entities, which can also be referred to as industrial, shopfloor, or workplace democracy (Editors 1980). Each of these meanings follows from one of the two central principles of economic democracy. The first follows from the Aristotelian premise that for citizens to be able to participate in the political life of a society their basic needs must be met; this requires that wealth and income be distributed in a way that ensures a minimum standard of living for everyone. The second meaning follows from the premise that the notion of a democratic society should not be limited to its political institutions, but that its economic institutions should be organized democratically as well. Both of these approaches challenge the division between the public and private spheres that is common in mainstream political science.

The term briefly came into heavy usage in the early 1940s, often as a companion to “political democracy,” and as part of an effort to identify a middle way between liberal capitalism and Soviet-style communism. It was a popular term used in a wide variety of ways to mean everything from principles of free enterprise and free trade, to policies ensuring a basic standard of living for everyone, to trade unionism, to central planning (Ascoli and Lehmann 1937; Brookings 1929; US Congress 1943). This attention was short-lived, however, and with the advent of McCarthyism there was a sharp drop in interest in the concept.

Interest in economic democracy rose within the academy in the 1970s, generally in the context of heterodox economics and critiques of capitalism focused on its anti-democratic character, and attempts within political theory to identify non-Marxist, non-socialist approaches to expanding the field of democratic participation (Pateman 1970; Macpherson 1973; Dahl 1985; Bowles and Gintis 1986; Ellerman 1992). In some cases

(e.g., Dahl and Ellerman), an effort was made to show that economic democracy is not only compatible with capitalism and private property but more consistent with liberal ideology than traditional liberal capitalism, while others (e.g., Macpherson; Bowles and Gintis) sought to show that capitalism and private property are inherently at odds with democracy. In addition, experiments with radical economic alternatives such as barter systems, collectives, and communes in the 1960s and 1970s counter-culture attracted the attention of sociologists and political scientists (Lindenfeld and Rothschild-Whitt 1982). The sense of potential, and the need for new alternatives in the wake of the collapse of the Soviet Union, led to increased interest in the field in the early 1990s. The dot.com bubble and its attendant recession of 2000–02 led to heightened interest in alternative forms of economic organization. As it became clear that most people would not experience any sort of post-Cold War “peace dividend” as inequality began to accelerate led some theorists to begin articulating ideas for a post-capitalist future (e.g., Alperovitz 2011).

Work in economic democracy is best described as applied theory, as concepts of democracy meet the real world of the economy. The system of industrial democracy in Yugoslavia was a common object of interest (e.g., Pateman 1970), at least until the country’s splintering, and the strong social welfare programs in the Scandinavian countries, especially Sweden, have been held up as models for economic democracy (Editors 1980). The cooperative movement, which is made up of economic institutions founded on principles of equality and democracy (Kaswan 2014), and worker-owned cooperatives in particular, have consistently been cited as examples of economic democracy in action and may be understood as prime examples of economic democracy, because they incorporate both democratic practices and promote economic equality. Important centers for research on economic democracy include the Democracy Collaborative at the University of Maryland, the Institute for the Study of Employee Ownership and Profit Sharing at the School of Management and Labor Relations at Rutgers University, and the International Centre of Research and Information on the Public, Social and

Cooperative Economy based at the University of Liège, Belgium.

Increasing inequality and the expanding feelings of economic precarity and injustice that come with it mean that economic democracy as a field of both theory and practice can expect to see considerable interest and development in the years ahead.

MARK KASWAN

References

- Albert, Michael Hahnel Robin. 1991. *The Political Economy of Participatory Economics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Alperovitz, Gar. 2011. *America Beyond Capitalism: Reclaiming Our Wealth, our Liberty, and Our Democracy*, 2nd edn. Boston: Dollar & Sense and the Democracy Collaborative Press.
- Ascoli, Max, and Fritz Lehmann, eds. 1937. *Political and Economic Democracy*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Bowles, Samuel, and Herbert Gintis. 1986. *Democracy & Capitalism: Property, Community, and the Contradictions of Modern Social Thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- Brookings, R.S. 1929. *Economic Democracy: America's Answer to Socialism and Communism*. New York: Macmillan.
- Dahl, Robert. 1985. *A Preface to Economic Democracy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Editors. 1980. "Announcing a New Journal." *Economic and Industrial Democracy* 1 (February): i–v.
- Ellerman, David. 1992. *Property and Contract in Economics: The Case for Economic Democracy*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.
- Kaswan, Mark J. 2014. *Happiness, Democracy and the Cooperative Movement: The Radical Utilitarianism of William Thompson*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Lindenfeld, Frank, and Joyce Rothschild-Whitt, eds. 1982. *Workplace Democracy and Social Change*. Boston: Extending Horizons Books.
- Macpherson, C. B. 1973. *Democratic Theory: Essays in Retrieval*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pateman, Carole. 1970. *Participation and Democratic Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- United States Congress, House of Representatives. 1943. *Hearings*. Vol. 2: Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

See also

Crises of Capitalism; Participatory Democracy; Inequality; Socialism

88. Participatory democracy

Participatory democracy is a normative model of democracy in which ordinary citizens contribute directly to the formation of public policies and other political decisions. Often presented as an alternative to the indirect, minimal, and optional forms of civic involvement associated with representative (and especially liberal) forms of democracy, proponents of participatory democracy endorse a variety of practices and activities to generate more robust and meaningful civic engagement inside and outside the formal channels of government, including the workplace. Whether promoting voting in referenda, organizing initiatives, the use of the recall to remove unresponsive office-holders, deliberation in public discussions, or collective acts of protest, champions of participatory democracy encourage engagement in political activities that empower citizens to make democratic ideals of self-determination and self-rule a reality.

The ideas and practices associated with participatory democracy can be traced back to Greek and Roman antiquity, where full citizens were expected to participate in periodic legislative assemblies and hold offices. Contemporary theories of participatory democracy are also inspired by the civic republican ideals of Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1978) and Thomas Jefferson, for whom direct participation in the legislative process was a precondition for the exercise of freedom by ordinary citizens. Beginning in the nineteenth century, radicals such as socialists, communists, and anarchists called for more meaningful forms of participation in response to the limited opportunities for participation, persistent exclusions of certain groups, and unresponsive nature of representative systems of democracy. The inability of representative institutions to address the concerns – or even to acknowledge the value – of marginalized groups during the political upheavals of the 1960s provoked calls to reinvigorate and reimagine democracy to give voice to the less powerful. Protests, marches, speeches, and gatherings orchestrated by numerous chapters of the civil rights movement, New Left organizations such as Students for a Democratic Society

(1962), and various sections of the women's rights movement inspired calls for more active involvement in and access to existing channels of government as well as alternative forms of political participation that bypassed reliance on established leaders, parliamentary forms, and hierarchical structures. The open, egalitarian, and emancipatory ideals pursued by activists during the Sixties have received renewed expression in contemporary anti-corporate, anti-racist, and environmentalist movements and organizations such as Occupy Wall Street, Black Lives Matter, and the African Youth Initiative on Climate Change. These ideas and activities have challenged widespread assumptions in mainstream empirical political science that democracy consists primarily of regularly scheduled voting in free and fair elections.

Despite its critiques of representative democracy, participatory democracy does not necessarily seek a total repudiation of representative institutions. It is best to think of these forms as lying on a continuum from more indirect to more direct forms of participation, and from lower to higher levels of participation. For instance, in his letters championing a system of local government that would allow citizen-legislators to vote directly on public matters at the smallest political sub-division, Thomas Jefferson presented his "ward" system as a supplement to, not a replacement for, representative government at higher county levels (Arendt 1963, 248–55). Contemporary political theorists such as Benjamin Barber (1984) still envisioned a meaningful role for elected office-holders at all levels of government in appealing for "strong democracy." What unifies different strands of participatory democracy is insistence that ordinary citizens, rather than elites (popularly chosen or not), ought to exercise greater power in the political process. Thus, groups such as Brazil's *Partido dos Trabalhadores* have called for citizens to exercise a greater share of power in decisions over budgeting, transportation, and other public issues (Avritzer 2009).

The appeal of participatory democracy compared to less direct forms of democracy is that it seeks to pursue the education and empowerment of ordinary citizens, greater transparency in the political process, improved performance by government, and enhanced legitimacy in the political system. However, critics raise assorted moral, intellectual, and

practical objections. James Madison, one of the architects of the elite-driven system of representative government challenged by supporters of participatory democracy, voiced concerns about all three dimensions. He expressed doubts that ordinary citizens possessed the virtues necessary to place the common good before narrow self-interest, the cognitive abilities to understand and make correct judgments about complex matters, or the resources and attention to conduct public business that took time away from private affairs. Better, Madison thought, to filter out the impurities of public opinion by “refin[ing] and enlarg[ing] ... them through the medium of a chosen body of citizens, whose wisdom may best discern the true interest of their country” (1987, 126). Feminist thinkers and others have also pointed out that the demands of participation are never distributed equally, so attempts to augment participation could end up exacerbating existing inequalities and structural disadvantages.

Defenders of participatory democracy sometimes look to new technologies to overcome some of the obstacles to greater and more informed civic participation that made representative democracy seem like a more viable form of government. Virtual town halls, online voting, and deliberative opinion polls allow citizens to express their preferences more easily, but more radical proponents of participatory democracy contend there is no substitute for direct, face-to-face,

and spontaneous action. Mini-publics and citizen assemblies, juries, and forums commissioned by existing political institutions enhance the participation of a few, but the ideal of participatory democracy has been a system that is inclusive of all citizens and generates power from the ground up.

CLEMENT FATOVIC

References

- Arendt, Hannah. 1963. *On Revolution*. New York: Penguin.
- Avritzer, Leonardo. 2009. *Participatory Institutions in Democratic Brazil*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Barber, Benjamin R. 1984. *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Madison, James. 1987. “Federalist 10.” *The Federalist Papers*. New York: Penguin.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. 1978. *On the Social Contract*. New York: St. Martin’s Press.
- Students for a Democratic Society. 1962. *The Port Huron Statement of the Students for a Democratic Society*.

Further readings

- Pateman, Carol. 1970. *Participation and Democratic Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

See also

- Barber, Benjamin; Deliberative Democracy

89. Populist democracy

Democracy is the predominate form of government in modern times. The basic principle of democracy is rule by the people. Due to the size and extent of modern nation states this involves rule through representative bodies selected in periodic elections. The requirement of political equality and the legal protection of citizenship rights create the rule that representatives must be tied to popular rule, particularly through elections (Arblaster 1987). Recently, many democratic systems have given rise to populist movements that frequently vie for power.

Populism is not a distinct political ideology; it is more of a political technique. The mass publics of populist movements sense changes in their social situation arising from cultural and economic dislocation resulting from integration with global markets. Populism weaponizes this popular discontent by attempting to mobilize an amorphous “people” against the machinations of “global elites” who are blamed for these dislocations (Judis 2016). Rodrik (2018) presents a theory of how populist movements work. His scheme divides society into three main groups: a national elite distinguished by wealth and social position, a majority of the middle class and poor, and a minority identified by ethnic, religious, or citizenship differences. This leads to two cleavages that populist movements can exploit: an economic (income/social class) cleavage and an identity (ethnic-nationalist/cultural) cleavage. These cleavages lead to different characterizations of the anti-establishment politics central to populist movements.

Right populism is driven by identity cleavages; elites mobilize majorities against minorities. Minorities are portrayed as tools of global elites intent on undermining national cultural and economic unity. This variety of populism accepts present domestic economies. A good example of a right populist democracy would be the present regime of Fidesz (the Alliance of Young Democrats) in Hungary. As the model predicts, unrest associated with the Great Recession and influxes of immigrants to Europe provided an opportunity to an elite group – Fidesz – to activate a majority of Hungarians and turn them against the influence of “global elites” (the European Union and international agencies)

supposedly sponsoring large-scale immigration to Hungary. Fidesz also exploited fears of indigenous minorities to fuel antagonisms. Led by Victor Orbán and his long-time associates, Fidesz shows markers of right-wing populist politics: extreme nationalism, restrictions on press and academic freedom, attacks on judicial independence, hostility toward the European Union and international capital, and, especially, opposition to immigration and oppression of minorities. Constitutional changes in representation have made the removal of Fidesz very difficult. Periodic elections still are held and Fidesz regularly obtains a plurality of votes and control of parliament. However, citizenship rights are under constant threat for Hungarian minorities and foreign nationals (Scheppele 2014).

Left populism, on the other hand, is driven by economic cleavages; majorities and minorities mobilize against elites. Elites are represented as tools of global elites aimed at destroying national economic independence. This variety of populism advocates reform of present economic structure. Left populist democracy is well represented by the PSUV (the United Socialist Party of Venezuela) regime in Venezuela. In 1998 Venezuelans elected Hugo Chavez Frias, a former army officer, as president. Chavez led a diffuse movement rallying the majority and minorities to overthrow rule by entrenched domestic elites and their foreign partners. Once in power, Chavez promulgated a new constitution and created the PSUV as an election vehicle. As with Fidesz, Chavez used his personal popularity and the executive levers in the new constitution to deliver signature reforms associated with left populism: extreme nationalism, a greatly expanded welfare system, increased infrastructural development, hostility toward international capital, increased participation in elections and governmental processes, and, especially, increased national control of economic resources and institutions. The PSUV has continued to rule Venezuela since Chavez’s death in 2013. The new PSUV government under Nicolás Maduro Moro has attempted to continue Chavez’s “Bolivarian Revolution,” albeit with national turmoil and indifferent results (Smilde 2015).

Once in power in democratic countries, populist governments can take steps that undermine democratic norms. But left and

right populism have different effects on democratic processes. Fidesz has openly disenfranchised voters, packed the court system, appealed to anti-semitism, used government regulatory power to support its business allies, and rigged the electoral system to make removing it from power almost impossible. The PSUV has disrupted the Venezuelan economy, passed laws (including suspending the 1999 constitution) that make prosecuting its enemies easier, and inhibited political competition. These actions are used to castigate all populist democracies and populism in general as a threat to representative democratic processes.

A moment's thought will make these conclusions doubtful. It is obvious that left populism – increasing political participation, protecting minority rights, and ensuring control of national economies through democratically chosen authorities – is more compatible with representative democratic principles. Yet left populist regimes like the ones in Venezuela and Bolivia typically receive the most condemnation and are subject to the most economic pressure. It took a full-scale war to subject a right populist Russia to sanctions. This difference is due to the attempts by left populist regimes

to disconnect from international capitalism. That resistance is why the movements that establish them continue to generate democratic support. When considering populism as a political phenomenon, it is important to assess its roots and analyse how different strands of populism affect democratic norms.

TRACY L. R. LIGHTCAP

References

- Arblaster, Anthony. 1987. *Democracy*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Judis, John B. 2016. *The Populist Explosion: How the Great Recession Transformed American and European Politics*. New York: Columbia Global Reports.
- Rodrik, Dani. 2019. "Populism and the Economics of Globalization." *Journal of International Business Policy* 1, nos. 1–2: 12–33.
- Scheppele, Kim Lane. 2014. "Hungary and the End of Politics." *The Nation*. (May 26).
- Smilde, David. 2015. "The End of Chavismo?" *Current History*. (February): 49–55.

Further readings

- Polyani, Karl. 1944. *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. New York: Beacon Press.

90. Radical democracy

Radical democracy is a democratic form that prioritizes the extension of equality, liberty, and power to all aspects of society. In general, radical democrats seek to address and change the fundamentals of democracy, expanding democracy to more arenas of political, social, and economic life (Bevir 2010). Radical democracy is typically associated with the theories of Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe in their work titled *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy* (1985). However, since their formulation there has been deep debate and disagreement on what radical democracy should be and what its application in society would look like.

Radical democracy typically seeks to expand the “democratic revolution” and link together diverse democratic struggles (Mouffe and Holdengraber 1989, 42). Equivalence is pursued among different struggles, tying the interests of groups like workers, women, immigrants, and people of color into one larger movement. Radical democracy embraces movements towards “self-sufficiency, autonomy, and territory,” and can often clash with the type of democracy proposed by “Western capitalist-modernist” democrats (Conway and Singh 2011, 690). If radical democracy is “institutionalized” it includes the institutionalization of “contestation,” meaning contestation is made a part of the system rather than something to be overcome (Dahlberg 2013). Contestation and peaceful conflict, rather than being embraced or stigmatized, are shaped into democratic institutions and life.

The radical democratic movement of the late twentieth century had three goals:

1. a “break with communism” and an embracement of the liberal democratic revolution;
2. the incorporation of struggles beyond the class struggle, and;
3. a reconceptualization of democracy as an open-ended project (Conway and Singh 2011, 691).

This project would be one that followed a “chain of equivalence” linking old and new democratic struggles and which sought to extend “democratic ideals of liberty and equality to more and more areas of social life”

(Conway and Singh 2011, 692). In response to existing liberal democracy, radical democrats sought a movement that embraces diverse democratic struggles, connects them together, and then challenges existing institutions that limit democracy (Dahlberg 2013). In the radical democratic tradition, there can only be true equality if other economic barriers to citizen participation are removed.

Three strands of radical democracy

Agonistic

The agonistic perspective of radical democracy is mostly associated with the work of Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, who argue that radical democracy moves past certain aspects of democratic ideals found in the enlightenment which prioritize individualism (Laclau and Mouffe 1985). Ideals which were once forces for democratization can now be seen as potential barriers to the continued extension of democratic revolution (Mouffe and Holdengraber 1989, 36). Radical democracy, by Mouffe’s definition, “actually means radical liberal democracy,” a radicalization of the existing political regime characteristic of the modern West (Conway and Singh 2011, 692). Mouffe and Laclau argue that deliberative democracy and liberal democracy seek consensus to a fault, oppressing opposing viewpoints. Their version of radical democracy seeks to bring forth a variety of viewpoints and interests, making them visible while challenging oppressive power relations (Laclau and Mouffe 1985). Radical democracy is not only accepting of dissent and differences, but is dependent on them, with the belief that the drawing out of differences will allow oppressive power relations to be properly challenged.

Deliberative

The deliberative strand of radical democracy opposes the agonistic view. Specifically associated with the work of Jürgen Habermas, deliberative democracy holds that political problems in society can be resolved through *deliberation* (Olson 2011). In Habermas’ view, institutions which are dedicated to the free and equal participation of all, combined with a process of consensus and communication building, can lead to the resolution of

conflict between opposing views and interests (Olson 2011). A deliberative democracy includes a deeper process for citizens to be engaged on how to solve public problems (Cohen and Fung 2011). Radical democrats in the deliberative strand ultimately seek to incorporate participatory and deliberative forms of democracy into political institutions (Cohen and Fung 2011).

Autonomist – anti-colonial

Conway and Singh (2011) propose that radical democracy as developed by Laclau and Mouffe is rooted in “Western Modernity” while the radical democracy of the global south “consists of place-based forms” of “colonial difference.” The autonomist strand of radical democracy centers “the community” as the primary focus of building democratic power (Dahlberg and Siapera 2007). In this strand of thought, the community represents a “plural multitude” of the diverse masses in society, which can reclaim power through creating mutual understandings in the community. Ion Mittler uses the term “multi-dimensional democracy” to describe this system of autonomist democracy, where the political system as a whole is made up of smaller autonomous communities (Mittler 2019).

Building on the autonomist strand, other theorists argue that the Western conception of radical democracy fails to account for the connection between Western liberal democracy and colonialism (Dhaliwal 1996). Therefore a “radical democracy” built on this tradition, like the one proposed by Laclau and Mouffe, will ultimately be colonial in nature and will not be compatible with the radical democratic movements of the Global South (Conway and Singh 2011). While agonistic or deliberative forms of radical democracy are based in western-liberalism and “modernity,” radical democracy in the global south can often take an autonomist and anti-colonial character due to material conditions driving democratization in those regions (Conway and Singh 2011).

Thus, overall, radical democracy seeks contestation and conflict as a positive, and that contestation is clearly present in the theory itself. Radical democrats seek to transform the public political sphere from one that is purely participatory or competitive into one that is deliberative and expansive, with the hope of solving societal problems while addressing the failings of modern liberal democracy.

MICHAEL SCIPIONI

References

- Bevir, Mark. 2010. “Radical Democracy.” In *Encyclopedia of Political Theory*, 1142–45. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Cohen, Joshua and Archon Fung. 2011. “Radical Democracy.” *Raisons Politiques* 42, No. 2: 115–30.
- Conway, Janet, and Jakeet Singh. 2011. “Radical Democracy in Global Perspective: Notes from the Pluriverse.” *Third World Quarterly* 32, no. 4: 689–706.
- Dahlberg, Lincoln. 2013. “Radical Democracy in Contemporary Times.” *E-International Relations*, 4. Accessed at: www.e-ir.info/2013/02/26/radical-democracy-in-contemporary-times/.
- Dahlberg, Lincoln, and Eugenia Siapera, eds. 2007. *Radical Democracy and the Internet: Interrogating Theory and Practice*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Dhaliwal, A. 1996. “Can the Subaltern Vote? Radical Democracy, Discourses of Representation and Rights, and Questions of Race.” In *Radical Democracy: Identity, Citizenship, and the State*, edited by D. Trend, 42–61. New York: Routledge.
- Laclau, Ernesto, and Chantal Mouffe. 1985. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso Press.
- Mittler, Ion. 2019. “The Best Possible Politics? Introduction to Multi-Dimensional Democracy.” Accessed from ionmittler.com.
- Mouffe, Chantal, and Paul Holdengräber. 1989. “Radical Democracy: Modern or Postmodern?” *Social Text*, no. 21, 31–45.
- Olson, K. 2011. “Deliberative democracy.” In *Jürgen Habermas: Key Concepts*, edited by B. Fultner, 140–55. London: Acumen Publishing.

91. Dependency theory

Dependency theory first emerged after World War II as a framework for pursuing a developmental path for Latin American industrialization and would go on to serve, with many variations, as a perspective for interpreting the history of capitalism as a whole. While rooted in earlier critical economic theories, it most explicitly began to emerge from the work of economists including Hans Singer and, more influentially, Raúl Prebisch whose 1950 report for the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America, “The Economic Development of Latin America,” would demonstrate one of the earliest analyses of the uneven and unequal relations between the world’s most powerful countries and those on the “periphery.” From here it was further elaborated by scholars, including Paul Baran, author of *The Political Economy of Growth* (1957) and Andre Gunder Frank who wrote a wide range of books on the “development of underdevelopment” in Latin America beginning in the late 1960s. Other highly influential scholars, including Arghiri Emmanuel (1972), Samir Amin (1976), Fernando Henrique Cardoso (1979), and Walter Rodney (2011) would work with the theory, along with Giovanni Arrighi and Immanuel Wallerstein who would further develop the perspective into a broader analysis of the “capitalist world-system.”

In contrast to perspectives of history rooted in neo-classical economics, which suggest that certain parts of the world are rich or poor due to the internal dynamics of those societies, for dependency theorists, the history of the modern, capitalist world is a history of the creation of a globally integrated economic system based around core-periphery relations. In other words, it is not that poorer regions of the world are “developing,” as some economists have put it. Rather, they were historically “underdeveloped” (Rodney 2011, 14). The core countries, primarily in Western Europe, were those that colonized the world from the end of the fifteenth century onward. They became wealthy not simply because of their internal dynamics of economic growth, but because they were able to extract wealth from Africa, Latin America, and Asia. Thus, the development of the core happened at the expense of the underdevelopment of the periphery. In par-

ticular, peripheral countries became stuck in a trap of exporting primary commodities to the industrial core; thus, holding back their own economic development in a dependency through relations of unequal exchange. For scholars such as Andre Gunder Frank, it was precisely because peripheral regions of the world economy were naturally rich with resources that they became targets of underdevelopment (Frank 1982, 23).

Dependency theory also suggested possible policy solutions to the problem of underdevelopment. While modernization theorists such as W.W. Rostow argued that the West could essentially provide a model for development elsewhere, as societies grew through stages of modernization, dependency theory provided an alternative path of development. Given that a central reason the wealthy became wealthy was because of the exploitation of the resources of the colonized world, so post-World War II Latin America, Africa, and Asia could not follow that model. Instead, industrial development and growth could only occur in the periphery of the capitalist world-system through the protection of national economies from pressures of the world market coming from the core. This would entail import-substitution industrialization strategies and protection from free trade imposed by the metropolis, although some critics took this further to suggest that the way forward for humanity would have to be the end of the capitalist system as a whole.

Dependency theory was never a single perspective, so much as a framework or a set of concepts used by a wide variety of scholars as a way of making sense of the global political economy. For example, Immanuel Wallerstein’s world-systems analysis incorporated many aspects of dependency theory into a broader theory and interpretation of the five-century history of the capitalist system. Wallerstein coupled dependency theory with a theory of hegemonic cycles (Wallerstein 1974), while scholars such as William Robinson have continued to draw from dependency theory by relying on the concepts of “core” and “periphery” to explain the dynamics of the rise of a supposed transnational capitalist class (Robinson 2008, 117).

On the whole, dependency theory has provided political scientists, sociologists, economists, and historians with a set of concepts, including core/metropolis and periphery,

underdevelopment, and unequal exchange, along with a broader perspective which suggests an analysis of the history of capitalism needs to centralize colonialism as a key aspect of capitalism's history and which continues to have a lasting influence on social science and historical research.

JAMES PARISOT

References

- Amin, Samir. 1976. *Unequal Exchange: An Essay on the Social Formations of Peripheral Capitalism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Cardoso, Fernando Henrique. 1979. *Dependency and Development in Latin America*, translated by Marjory Mattingly Urquidí. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Emmanuel, Arghiri. 1972. *Unequal Exchange: A Study in the Imperialism of Trade*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Frank, Andre Gunder. 1982. *Dependent Accumulation and Underdevelopment*. London: MacMillan Press, Ltd.
- Robinson, William. 2008. *Latin America and Global Capitalism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Rodney, Walter. 2011. *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. Baltimore: Black Classic Press.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1974. *The Modern World-System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Academic Press.

Further readings

- Amin, Samir, Giovanni Arrighi, Andre Gunder Frank, and Immanuel Wallerstein, eds. 1982. *Dynamics of Global Crisis*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Ghosh, B.N. 2021. *Dependency Theory Revisited*. New York: Routledge.
- Swainson, Nicola. 1980. *Development of Corporate Capitalism in Kenya, 1918–1977*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

See also

- Andre Gunder Frank; Samir Amin; Immanuel Wallerstein; Theories of Imperialism

92. Direct action

As long as there have been political struggles between the state and “the people,” there have been direct actions against the state enacted by the people. The earliest explicit theorization of direct action is most often credited to the anarchist Voltairine de Cleyre in her early 1900s essay of the same name (de Cleyre 2016, 220). Other notable theorizations have come from Mohandas Gandhi (1961), Martin Luther King, Jr. (1963), Angela Davis (2016, chap. 9), Howard Zinn (2002), Noam Chomsky (2008, chap. 5), and Saul Alinsky (1989), among others. Synthesizing these works, as well as a number of activists’ contributions, direct action can be defined as a confrontational method of politics in which the people use their power, whether economic, physical, or otherwise defined, to accomplish an immediate political goal or to challenge the source of their oppression. Direct actions are therefore different from indirect actions as they are enacted outside of institutionalized power structures like the state, police, or corporations, and usually involve a willingness to engage in combative tactics against those very power structures (Murray, 2020). Deepening our engagement with “the what” of direct action, however, requires consideration of the who, the how, and the why of direct action.

Although direct action can be enacted by any politically engaged group, it is most often associated with progressive or Leftist activism due to their rejection of authoritarian and hierarchical modes of organizing society. “The who” of direct action, then, are those seeking alternatives to working within the constraints of party politics or hierarchical state and corporate apparatuses, and who challenge such power directly. Activist and philosopher Grace Lee Boggs provides an apt reflection on “the who” of direct action: “we are the leaders we are looking for” (2012, chap. 6). In this view, instituting political change does not mean waiting for those in power to act or make a concession; instead, the power of direct action lies in a commitment to *autonomous* action, to addressing political problems without appealing to those who already possess institutional authority.

For those engaged in direct action, “the how” of direct action is both wide-ranging and contingent. Almost every social movement of

the past century has included some form of direct action in their repertoire of tactics. Direct actions can include, but are not limited to, nonviolent tactics such as civil disobedience; violent tactics such as property destruction; and corporeal tactics such as blocking access to particularly contested sites. Some specific examples include Civil Rights activists sitting in at segregated lunch counters, labor unions striking, Plowshares sabotaging military equipment, environmental activists sitting in trees or burying themselves in dirt roads to prevent access to fracking sites or old growth forests, antifascists engaging in property destruction in order to deplatform fascist speakers, anti-globalization activists blocking trade delegates from attending (undemocratic) economic summits, animal liberation activists freeing animals from research labs, antiwar activists burning draft cards, or water protectors using their bodies to delay and stop pipeline construction. What all of these tactics have in common is the deployment of the people’s corporeal and physical power to directly confront or stop the source of political oppression at its most accessible point.

Similarly, “the how” of direct action involves implementation of a diversity of tactics. Although some may equate direct action with protests in general, it is worth noting that while protests can, and often do, involve direct action, protests can also be intended to make demands of authority figures, or to simply raise awareness about a problem – the hallmarks of indirect action. In practice, of course, activist organizing usually involves all of these – appealing to multiple audiences and employing various tactics to meet a number of goals. Historically, the most effective movements have been those that draw on a diversity of tactics, including direct action. However, directly accessing the source of oppression, especially in the form of the state or police, has become increasingly difficult as surveillance technologies, regulations in protest spaces, and militarized police violence against activists work to discipline the disruptive power of most protests, especially those that include direct action. Therefore, the contingent and flexible nature of direct action tactics can be necessary as the public spaces of democracy evolve and become more oppressive.

Finally, “the why” of direct action is likely the most misunderstood component of activist work. In popular understandings, and even

in some scholarly work about how social change can and should happen, direct action is either underexamined or (mis)understood as a method of garnering media attention. In part, these misconceptions arise from a focus (particularly in liberal politics) on deliberation as the best (or only) mode of engaging in democracy. The purpose and effectiveness of direct actions, then, are often written out of theorizing; their motivation is reduced to an often-myopic focus on increasing media attention in order to facilitate deliberations among publics and/or the state. Although direct action can, and often does, secure media attention to raise awareness, garnering media attention is not often the purpose of direct action, nor is it the only way its effectiveness should be evaluated.

Instead, it is better to understand “the why” of direct action on its own terms. Direct actions seek to confront political problems head-on, at their most accessible points. For example, water protectors who endure the violence of the police-state while blocking an energy corporation’s access to pipeline construction sites may garner sympathetic media attention, but their use of direct action is better understood according to its effectiveness in halting the source of their political, cultural, and environmental oppression. Understood as a method of political action, such direct action certainly has symbolic value, but its value for those involved lies in its ability to challenge power at its most accessible points. Those engaging in direct action are not *asking* power to concede something, nor seeking attention/awareness. They are instead using the power of the people to challenge dominant ways of “doing politics” and ways of thinking about the state, the people, and their power.

BILLIE MURRAY

References

- Alinsky, Saul. 1989. *Rules for Radicals: A Practical Primer for Realistic Radicals*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Boggs, Grace Lee. 2012. *The Next American Revolution: Sustainable Activism for the Twenty-First Century*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2008. *The Essential Chomsky*, edited by Anthony Arnone. New York: The New Press.
- Cleyre, Voltairine de. 2016. *Selected Works of Voltairine de Cleyre: Poems, Essays, Sketches and Stories, 1885–1911*. Edited by Alexander Berkman. Oakland: AK Press.
- Davis, Angela Y. 2016. *Freedom Is a Constant Struggle: Ferguson, Palestine, and the Foundations of a Movement*. Edited by Frank Barat. Chicago: Haymarket Books.
- Gandhi, M. K. 1961. *Non-Violent Resistance (Satyagraha)*. Reprint edition. Mineola: Dover Publications.
- King, Jr., Martin Luther. 1963. “Letter from a Birmingham Jail.” African Studies Center-University of Pennsylvania. April 16, 1963. www.africa.upenn.edu/Articles_Gen/Letter_Birmingham.html.
- Murray, Billie. 2020. “Reimagining Activism as Combative.” In *Reimagining Communication: Action*, edited by Michael Filimowicz and Veronika Tzankova, 15–33. New York: Routledge.
- Zinn, Howard. 2002. “Artists and Citizens in a Time of War.” *Seattle Journal for Social Justice* 1, no. 1: 51–57.

Further readings

- Malm, Andreas. 2021. *How to Blow Up a Pipeline*. London: Verso.
- Murray, Billie. 2022. “Violence and Nonviolence in the Rhetoric of Social Protest.” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 25, no. 3: 147–68.
- Osterweil, Vicky. 2020. In *Defense of Looting: A Riotous History of Uncivil Action*. New York: Bold Type Books.

See also

Anarchism; Antifascism; Community Armed Self-Defense; Democracy (Participatory); Democracy (Radical); Diversity of Tactics; Social Movement Analysis

93. Diversity of tactics

Diversity of tactics refers to the pursuit by participants in a political cause of multiple avenues of action that vary significantly in their qualitative dimensions. During the twentieth century, the term was used by scholars to reference the use of a spectrum of tactics that crossed various categorical divides, such as institutional/non-institutional action (Kallen 1954; Meyer 1990) or high/low intensity action (Pulido 1996, 108), as well as repertoires of action that spanned several different divides (Melendez and Melendez 1993). In the new millennium, the term entered regular use in anarchist and socialist circles to specifically describe the employment of tactics that differ substantially in their degree of militancy, violence, or illegality. This usage has since become dominant in both public and academic discourse.

After protests at Montreal's 2001 Summit of the Americas spiraled into a three-day-long uprising in the city, anarchists began to reflect upon a distinctive strategic principle they had employed at the summit, a self-professed "diversity of tactics" approach, which encouraged protesters to self-select participation in "red" (violent street-fighting), "yellow" (non-violent illegal disruption), and "green" (purely peaceful, non-disruptive) zones of protest (CLAC/CASA 2001). With this strategy held to have been highly effective, anarchist activists sought to refine the concept, and reflect on how it might be a useful guideline for future action. During this period of discussion, elaborations on the "diversity of tactics" approach tended to draw upon two different, but complementary perspectives, which I term here the "Principled" and "Strategic" approaches, respectively.

The "Principled" approach advocated for causes' capacity to permit struggle on an individual's own terms, rather than policing protagonists' behaviour. This conception of a diversity of tactics was generally underpinned by a loosely autonomist ethical approach that justified non-intervention in other activists' activities on normative or prefigurative grounds. It called on demonstrators to respect the integrity of others' actions in a way that would allow peaceful protest to coexist alongside more disruptive efforts, rather than bifurcating causes into

peaceful mainstreams and radical flanks (or vice versa) (Milstein 2001; Phebus 2001).

By contrast, "Strategic" approaches to tactical diversity laid out how measures crossing the boundaries of violence, criminality, and militancy could be intentionally coordinated with more conventional strategies to maximize movement success, pointing to examples such as the British Suffragette Movement, the Anti-Apartheid Movement in South Africa, and the Civil Rights struggles in the United States (Gelderloos 2007; Warwick 2019). This strategic conceptualization has also found expression among some Marxists, who have argued that it constitutes an effective extension of Marx and Engels' advocacy for a "Revolution in Permanence" (Barrow 2019).

Today, anarchists and activist scholars who endorse the notion of a diversity of tactics often seek to marry principled and strategic approaches, arguing that respecting autonomous modes of struggle also tends to confer strategic advantages to a cause (Gelderloos 2013). Advocates of this hybrid perspective have pointed to the fruitful admixture of spontaneous illegality and violence with peaceful protest during mass uprisings, and the capacity of autonomous actions to generate novel opportunities across the spectrum of contention and increase movement resilience (Case 2022; Evans 2022).

The practical combination of a principled, autonomous approach to a diversity of tactics, and one that primarily seeks to confer concerted strategic advantages, can prove quite difficult. There are inevitably contexts in which violent and illegal protest actions prove misplaced and come to serve as a justification for movement delegitimization, enhanced repression, and political revanchism that entrenches the very phenomenon against which a cause might be seeking to protest (Edwards and Arnon, 2021; Simpson, Willer, and Feinberg 2018). Conversely, when causes that employ illegal or violent methods also enter into coalition with groups observing exclusively non-violent forms of participation, they may be subject to "peace policing." This phenomenon involves non-violent participants actively undermining, ostracizing, and constraining those employing more disruptive methods, including – at its most extreme – using physical force or even informing the authorities of protesters' identities, actions, or future plans. In other cases,

non-violent groups or organizations may use their resources to engage in condemnatory framing against a “violent flank” of others employing more diverse tactics, with the aim of marginalizing or displacing such actors. Such conflicts caused much consternation among anarchists involved in the Occupy Wall Street movement (Schneider 2011; Devereaux 2012).

In the political science literature, the dominant trend of scholarship has generally run counter to the notion that employing such a “diversity of tactics” might be useful for causes seeking to further their political aims. In particular, an expansive literature on “Civil Resistance” advocates instead that protesters pursue “nonviolent discipline”: the practice of strictly ensuring pacifist participation in protest (Chenoweth and Stephan 2011; Nepstad 2013). Writ large, this literature has tended to generalize from studies of violent and nonviolent intrastate conflicts (in which violence is generally characterized by armed civil warfare) to argue that instances of exceedingly minor violence are also detrimental to domestic social, revolutionary, and resistance movements. Yet, more recent work in the social and political sciences has problematized the empirical and theoretical claims underpinning this literature, and called for greater attention to the nuances of civilian struggles of all kinds. This trajectory of scholarship has drawn on the study of recent revolutionary campaigns in Egypt and Ukraine (Kadivar and Ketchley 2018; Beck et al. 2022; Beissinger 2022), domestic social movements such as the 2020 Black Lives Uprising (Abrams 2023), and careful reassessments of existing datasets (Ansin 2020; Case 2022). The general consensus arising from recent research is that across many important cases in contemporary contentious politics, it is neither extreme violence nor exclusive non-violence that accomplishes a movement’s goals, but indeed a diversity of tactics.

BENJAMIN ABRAMS

References

- Abrams, Benjamin. 2023. *The Rise of the Masses: Spontaneous Mobilization and Contentious Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Anisin, Alexei. 2020. “Debunking the Myths Behind Nonviolent Civil Resistance.” *Critical Sociology* 46, nos. 7/8: 1121–39.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 2019. “Marxist Political Theory, Diversity of Tactics, and the Doctrine of the Long Civil War.” *New Political Science* 41, no. 4: 622–53.
- Beck, Colin J., Mlada Bukovansky, Erica Chenoweth, George Lawson, Sharon Erickson Nepstad, and Daniel P. Ritter. 2022. *On Revolutions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Beissinger, Mark R. 2022. *The Revolutionary City: Urbanization and the Global Transformation of Rebellion*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Case, Benjamin. 2022. *Street Rebellion: Resistance Beyond Violence and Nonviolence*. Chico, CA: AK Press.
- Chenoweth, Erica, and Maria Stephan. 2012. *Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- CLAC/CASA. 2001. “CLAC Basis of Unity” Quebec2001.Net. Available at: <https://web.archive.org/web/20010411090704/http://www.quebec2001.net:80/principesen.html>.
- Devereaux, Ryan. 2012. “Occupy Wall Street: ‘There’s a Militant Animosity Bred by Direct Action’.” *The Guardian*, February 3. Available at: www.theguardian.com/world/2012/feb/03/occupy-wall-street-animosity-direct-action.
- Edwards, Pearce, and Daneil Arnon. 2021. “Violence on Many Sides: Framing Effects Protest and Support for Repression.” *British Journal of Political Science* 51, no. 2: 388–506.
- Evans, Erin M. 2022. “Animal Advocacy and ‘Good Cop-Bad Cop’ Radical Flanking of Laboratory Research.” *Sociological Inquiry*. Early View. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soin.12521>.
- Gelderloos, Peter. 2007. *How Nonviolence Protects the State*. Boston: South End Press.
- Gelderloos, Peter. 2013. *The Failure of Nonviolence: From the Arab Spring to Occupy*. St. Louis: Left Bank Books.
- Kadivar, Mohammad Ali, and Neil Ketchley. 2018. “Sticks, Stones, and Molotov Cocktails: Unarmed Collective Violence and Democratization.” *Socius* 4 (January–December).
- Kallen, Horace Meyer. 1954. *Secularism is the Will of God*. New York: Twayne Publishers.
- Meléndez, Edwin and Edgardo Meléndez. 1993. “Introduction.” In *Colonial Dilemma: Critical Perspectives on Contemporary Puerto Rico*, edited by Edwin Meléndez and Edgardo Meléndez, 1–18. Boston: South End Press.
- Meyer, David S. 1990. *A Winter of Discontent: The Nuclear Freeze and American Politics*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Milstein, Cindy. 2001. “Something Did Start in Quebec City: North America’s Revolutionary Anti-Capitalist Movement.” *The Northeastern Anarchist*. #2, Spring. Available at: <https://usa.anarchistlibraries.net/library/cindy>

- milstein-something-did-start-in-quebec-city
-north-america-s-revolutionary-anti-capitalist.
- Nepstad, Sharon Erikson. 2013. "Nonviolent Resistance and Social Movements." *Sociology Compass* 7, no. 7: 590–98.
- Phebus, Nicolas. 2001. "Building a Campaign of Solidarity and General Amnesty." *The Northeastern Anarchist*. #2, Spring. Available at: <https://usa.anarchistlibraries.net/library/nicolas-phebus-building-a-campaign-of-solidarity-and-general-amnesty>.
- Pulido, Laura, 1996. *Environmentalism and Economic Justice: Two Chicano Struggles in the Southwest*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press
- Schneider, Nathan. 2011. "What 'Diversity of Tactics' Really Means for Occupy Wall Street." *Waging Nonviolence*, October 19. Available at: <https://wagingnonviolence.org/2011/10/what-diversity-of-tactics-really-means-for-occupy-wall-street/>.
- Simpson, Brent, Robb Willer, and Matthew Feinberg. 2018. "Does Violent Protest Backfire? Testing a Theory of Public Reactions to Activist Violence." *Socius* 4 (January–December).
- Warwick, John. 2019. "No, Extinction Rebels, Nonviolence is not the Only Way." *Roar Magazine*, October. Available at: <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/john-warwick-no-extinction-rebels-nonviolence-is-not-the-only-way>.

94. Domination

The concept of “domination” refers generically to rule, control, or ascendancy, but it also names a specific form of rule conceived on analogy to or as approximating slaveholding. In the former, generic sense, domination is the successful claiming of authority or the successful imposition of control. In the latter, specific sense, domination is the possession of a type of power, whether or not that power issues in successfully realizing the intentions of its possessor. In the first sense, to dominate is to *be in control*. In the latter sense, to dominate is to *be uncontrolled and powerful*. Only in the second sense is domination a theoretically fruitful concept, because only then does it pick out a socially significant and tractable phenomenon; we are all always in control of some things and not others, and what constitutes and shapes our sphere of control is too heterogenous and shifting to define.

The social significance of domination as uncontrolled power is most visible from below. Human beings subject to domination are in an uncomfortable situation. The dominated have good reason to believe that the dominator can interfere in their lives and affect their interests in ways the dominated cannot control. This gives rise to special forms of anxiety or uncertainty, since the dominated find themselves in a high-stakes strategic interaction: (1) what they can do depends on (a) what the dominator lets them do, (b) how the dominator perceives them, their intentions, and their actions, and (c) the dominator’s attitude toward them, their intentions, and their actions; but (2) what the dominator can do to them does *not* depend on – though it may be swayed by – anything they might do or want or care about (Douglass 2003; Jacobs 2015; Lovett 2010; Pettit 1997).

Being dominated, in this sense, is reasonably considered incompatible with self-determination or with human flourishing. Therefore, this relationship has long been the object of critical political thought, as well as the target of emancipatory struggles.

There are three significant theoretical controversies regarding domination: whether domination is compatible with rule-governed regularity, whether social structures and other non-agential powers can dominate, and whether occasional exposure to uncon-

trolled power is sufficient to count as being dominated.

The first controversy arises because of an ambiguity in the traditional definition of domination as exposure to *arbitrary* power. If arbitrariness is taken to be the opposite of rational regularity, then rule-governed regularity in the exercise of power is sufficient to secure freedom from domination. However, if arbitrariness is taken as a reference to an alien will, then rule-governed regularity is insufficient. So long as the rules themselves are not responsive to those subject to the power, the subjects remain dominated. What is at stake is whether a legal order in which the powerful are bound to follow predictable and general rules is sufficient to render everyone subject to this order free, or whether some substantial measure of democratic control over the content of the rules is also necessary (Lovett 2012; Markell 2008; Pettit 2012).

A second, closely-related controversy is whether non-agential beings – social structures, natural forces, and so on – can dominate, or whether the role of dominator must be filled by individual or corporate persons. The most common position is that purely impersonal forces or powers cannot themselves dominate. Being subject to uncontrollable natural forces, for example, does not have the *strategic* element that is so distinctive of domination. However, impersonal structures and forces can both (1) empower people to dominate and (2) differentially harm the dominated (Hasan 2021). Patriarchy might be an impersonal system of social valuation, for example, which *enables* the domination of women, children, and vulnerable men by dominant men (Einspahr 2010). On the other hand, exposure to natural threats may be one way in which dominators can harm the interests of the dominated, without anyone being dominated *by* nature. Domination is an intrinsically *social* phenomenon (Gädeke 2021). Whether it is also an intrinsically *personal* phenomenon is more difficult. What is at stake is whether, for instance, one can be dominated by the market, or by capital, or whether, on the contrary, one can only be dominated by particular market actors (e.g., monopolists) and particular capitalists (Gourevitch 2015; Marx 1976; Pettit 2006; Roberts 2017).

A final controversy concerns whether merely occasional and punctual exposure to uncontrolled power is sufficient to constitute

domination. What is at stake here is whether socially illegitimate forms of power – the power of an individual armed criminal, for instance – are forms of domination. Here the phenomenology of being dominated seems to indicate *yes*: being accosted or threatened puts one in a high-stakes strategic situation, and reasonably gives rise to anxiety and fear. However, this risks emptying domination of all meaning. As mortal creatures, we are always vulnerable to some extent. If the possibility that another might overwhelm us with force is sufficient to constitute domination, then domination is an inescapable phenomenon (Gädeke 2020). Here the original analogy to slavery must be recalled. An enslaved person is subject to a form of *social death* – they cannot count on any social support against their dominator, and their dominator can count on social support against the enslaved (Patterson 1982). It is this difference in social standing, and the mutual knowledge thereof, that makes domination distinctive. The encounter with the dominator may be occasional and punctual, but the structure of social sanctions that empowers one and disempowers the other must be fairly persistent and stable.

WILLIAM CLARE ROBERTS

References

- Douglass, Frederick. 2003. *My Bondage and My Freedom*, edited by John David Smith. New York: Penguin Books.
- Einspahr, Jennifer. 2010. "Structural Domination and Structural Freedom: A Feminist Perspective." *Feminist Review* 94, no 1: 1–19.
- Gädeke, Dorothea. 2020. "Does a Mugger Dominate? Episodic Power and the Structural Dimension of Domination." *Journal of Political Philosophy* 28, no. 2 (June): 199–221.
- Gädeke, Dorothea. 2021. "Who Should Fight Domination? Individual Responsibility and Structural Injustice." *Politics, Philosophy & Economics* 20, no. 2 (May): 180–201.
- Gourevitch, Alex. 2015. *From Slavery to the Cooperative Commonwealth: Labor and Republican Liberty in the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hasan, Rafeeq. 2021. "Republicanism and Structural Domination." *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 102, no. 2 (June): 292–319.
- Jacobs, Harriet. 2015. *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl*. Edited by R.J. Ellis. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lovett, Frank. 2010. *A General Theory of Domination and Justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lovett, Frank. "What Counts as Arbitrary Power?" 2012. *Journal of Political Power* 5, no. 1 (April): 137–52.
- Markell, Patchen. 2008. "The Insufficiency of Non-Domination." *Political Theory* 36, no. 1: 9–36.
- Marx, Karl. 1976. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, Vol. 1, translated by Ben Fowkes. London: Penguin.
- Patterson, Orlando. 1982. *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Pettit, Philip. 2006. "Freedom in the Market." *Politics, Philosophy and Economics* 5: 131–49.
- Pettit, Philip. 2012. *On the People's Terms: A Republican Theory and Model of Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pettit, Philip. 1997. *Republicanism: A Theory of Freedom and Government*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Roberts, William Clare. 2017. *Marx's Inferno: The Political Theory of Capital*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

95. Dual power

During the Russian Revolution of 1917 “dual power” was an unstable experiment in how to realize popular power when the state is in the hands of “bourgeois” liberals who claimed to be “above class” (Rosenberg 1974) and when even socialists feared that lower-class power would fail given the country’s underdevelopment. Some contemporaries viewed dual power as a progressive and inclusive new form of democracy, a realization of popular social power through elected committees and councils (“soviets”) by workers, soldiers, and peasants. Many others viewed dual power as did Trotsky (who wrote one of the first analyses of dual power in Russia and comparatively): an unstable and doomed equilibrium among classes too weak to take full control of the state, but which would “inevitably explode” into civil war – the “territorial expression” of dual power – until one class triumphed, as it did in Russia in October 1917 (Trotsky 1932, 206–15).

Dual power expressed social and political struggle at both the level of the state and in micropolitical environments (Rabinowitch 1976; Hasegawa 1981; Fitzpatrick 2008; Smith 2002; Steinberg 2017). At the state level, dual power was, on the one side, formal control of government by the Provisional Government, established by members of liberal political parties and later joined by socialists, and, on the other, the allegiance of most workers and soldiers (and, soon, peasants) to the Soviet of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies, led by educated elites from the main socialist parties. The Soviet leader Nikolai Sukhanov characterized the situation as “two sources of state power – one formally acknowledged and the other in control of all the real power” (Sukhanov 1955 [1922], 215).

The Provisional Government, for both practical and idealistic reasons, often deferred to the Soviet as an informal parliament of the common people. The Provisional Government, after all, itself was self-appointed by members of the old legislature (the Duma) and considered its democratic mandate limited (hence the name “provisional”) until a Constituent Assembly could be elected by all citizens of the new republic. The Soviet used their popular power, including to call people into the streets, to demand

and often win decisions beneficial to workers and peasants. But they rejected calls for “Soviet power,” increasingly heard from the street and echoed by Bolsheviks, as likely leading to “catastrophe.” Dual power was also embodied in almost every power relationship in the country: in the army between the officer corps and elected soldiers’ committees, in factories between management and elected workers’ committees, in villages between the traditional commune and new peasant committees.

Dual power was a political manifestation of class divisions, social change, and instability. As such, it looked simpler than the binary name suggests. Not only was the degree of cooperation and conflict between sides varied and changeable across the country and over time, but in many parts of the empire bodies representing local nationalities and other groups complicated these relationships still further.

While many liberals and moderate socialists considered dual power a viable form of radical democracy, the radical left viewed only class-based Soviet power as the truly democratic path. How democracy was understood in 1917 is significant. In the popular language of 1917, “democracy” meant not the institutional representation of all citizens but a social idea: the non-privileged and non-exploiting classes and their political potential (Kolonitskii 1998; Steinberg 2001). Dual power, in this sense, was a contested and ultimately abandoned practice based on the belief that government could exist independently of class relationships and the common people could exercise power and promote their interests without fully controlling the state.

MARK D. STEINBERG

References

- Engelstein, Laura. 2018. *Russia in Flames: War, Revolution, Civil War, 1914–1921*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fitzpatrick, Sheila. 2008. *The Russian Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hasegawa, Tsuyoshi. 1981. *The February Revolution: Petrograd, 1917*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Kolonitskii, Boris. 1998. “‘Democracy’ in the Political Consciousness of the Russian Revolution,” *Slavic Review* 57, no. 1 (Spring): 95–106.

- Rabinowitch, Alexander. 1976. *The Bolsheviks Come to Power*. New York: Norton.
- Rosenberg, William. 1974. *Liberals in the Russian Revolution: The Constitutional Democratic Party, 1917–1921*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Smith, S. A. 2002. *The Russian Revolution: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Steinberg, Mark D. 2017. *The Russian Revolution, 1905–1921*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Idem. 2001. *Voices of Revolution, 1917*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Sukhanov, N. N. 1955 (1922). *The Russian Revolution: A Personal Record*. Edited and translated by Joel Carmichael. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Trotsky, Leon. 1932. *The History of the Russian Revolution*, vol. 1. Translated by Max Eastman. New York: Simon and Schuster.

See also

Marxism; Theories of the State; Power Structure Analysis; Council Communism; Democracy

96. Environmental justice

The field of environmental justice studies is largely focused on three interrelated questions: how are social inequality and environmental quality linked? What roles do social movements play in shaping environmental policy? How can we improve people's quality of life and promote ecological sustainability? For more than four decades, scholars have documented environmental injustices in the U.S. and around the globe. Environmental injustice is the term used to describe the fact that certain populations suffer disproportionately high burdens of environmental harm, whether from high concentrations of water, air, or soil pollution, proximity to hazardous industrial operations, or the risks of anthropogenic climate change. The most heavily impacted populations include people of color, Indigenous peoples, low-wealth communities, global South communities, migrants, women, and LGBTQ folx (Bullard 2000; Collins, Grineski, and Morales 2017; Hoover 2018; Sze 2020; Taylor 2000; Whyte 2017). The documentation of these injustices served to amplify ongoing and new mobilizations by grassroots advocates, giving rise to the movement for environmental justice. That movement's vision is of a society in which no community is unfairly burdened with pollution or other environmental risks and when social justice and ecological sustainability prevail.

For political scientists and other scholars interested in flows of power within and across societies, environmental justice is an area of interest that is ideal for exploration. For example, the empirical evidence suggests that the single most important driving force behind our environmental and climate crises is inequality – social and political imbalances that facilitate decision-making by institutions that concentrates risks in certain communities while protecting others. More broadly, those societies with higher levels of egalitarianism are more likely to feature policies that are protective of their ecosystems and climate, while the reverse is also true (Boyce 2008; Wilkinson and Pickett 2011).

The generally accepted path toward addressing social ills like environmental injustice is to call on policy makers and

government agencies to address these concerns. Unfortunately, the hopes that the state would take strong steps to resolve this crisis have been dashed repeatedly. For example, in its multi-decade history of processing environmental discrimination claims from communities around the U.S. that are inundated with pollution from corporations, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has never once made a formal finding of a civil rights violation. Furthermore, as the primary government agency tasked with regulating environmental threats and promoting environmental justice, the U.S. EPA, has itself been internally conflicted and inconsistent with respect to even embracing the goal of environmental justice (Harrison 2019). These findings offer a sober caution to scholars and community advocates who place their faith in the state to manage threats to environmental and public health, and recently environmental justice scholars have called on researchers and grassroots activists to proceed with caution if and when they do engage the state, in some cases promoting anarchist leanings (Pellow 2017; Pulido et al. 2016).

More recently, scholars have raised deeper, thornier questions about the causes of environmental injustice and what any solutions-based framework might look like. For example, while the more proximate factors contributing to environmental injustice include discriminatory zoning and planning and racially segregated housing markets, the root causes are glaring political and wealth inequalities associated with racial capitalism and settler colonialism. Those root driving forces are much more difficult to address since they are centuries old systems of dominance and control that are reinforced by virtually all major political and economic institutions today. Racial capitalism is the term that scholars use to note that because racism has fueled capitalism from its inception, therefore the two are inseparable (Pulido et al. 2016). Thus when we observe that capitalism also requires the extraction of ecological wealth, creating pollution and climate change, those dynamics are propelled in large part by the social production of racial differences. Relatedly, settler colonialism is a system of dominance that involves the control over Indigenous people, land and ecosystems, which harms natural systems and therefore undermines the ability of Indigenous peoples to uphold their own

economic practices, cultures, and political processes. Thus, both racial capitalism and settler colonialism are longstanding systems of violence that contribute to and constitute environmental injustices (Pulido et al. 2016; Whyte 2017). For mainstream political scientists and other scholars whose research tends to implicitly or explicitly accept existing political and economic systems, these assertions are challenging, to say the least, because they suggest quite clearly that those systems must be abolished and reimagined entirely.

DAVID N. PELLOW

References

- Boyce, James K. 2008. "Is Inequality Bad for the Environment?" *Research in Social Problems and Public Policy* 15: 267–88.
- Bullard, Robert D. 2000. *Dumping in Dixie: Race, Class, and Environmental Quality*, 3rd edn. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Collins, Timothy, Sara Grineski, and Danielle Morales. 2017. "Environmental Injustice and Sexual Minority Health Disparities: A National Study of Inequitable Health Risks from Air Pollution Among Same-sex Partners." *Social Science & Medicine* 191: 38–47.
- Harrison, Jill Lindsey. 2019. *From the Inside Out: The Fight for Environmental Justice within Government Agencies*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.
- Hoover, Elizabeth. 2018. "Environmental Reproductive Justice: Intersections in an American Indian Community Impacted by Environmental Contamination." *Environmental Sociology* 4, no. 1: 8–21.
- Pellow, David N. 2017. *What is Critical Environmental Justice?* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Pulido, Laura, Ellen Kohl, and Nicole-Marie Cotton. 2016. "State Regulation and Environmental Justice: The Need for Strategy Reassessment." *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 27, no. 2: 12–31.
- Sze, Julie. 2020. *Environmental Justice in a Moment of Danger*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Taylor, Dorceta E. 2000. "The Rise of the Environmental Justice Paradigm: Injustice Framing and the Social Construction of Environmental Discourses." *American Behavioral Scientist* 43, no. 4: 508–80.
- Whyte, Kyle Powys. 2017. "The Dakota Access Pipeline, Environmental Injustice, and U.S. Colonialism." *Red Ink* 19, no. 1: 154–69.
- Wilkinson, Richard and Kate Pickett. 2011. *The Spirit Level: Why Greater Equality Makes Societies Stronger*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

See also

Ecology and Environmental Theory; Murray Bookchin; Andre Gorz; Indigenous Movements

97. Ethnicity

The term “ethnicity” first appeared in the *Oxford English Dictionary* in 1953, but the word “ethnic” has been used for centuries, and its origins can be traced back to “ethnos,” which is a Greek word “used in reference to band, tribe, race, a people, or a swarm” (Baumann 2004, 12). Over time, this term was replaced by the concept of “tribes,” which was used to describe indigenous groups globally until the 1960s, when it was replaced by the concept of an “ethnic group” or the word “ethnic.”

Similar to race, ethnicity is a socially constructed concept. In some contexts, race and ethnicity are connected, but the two concepts are separate and distinct. Although both concepts are assigned at birth, racial categories are assigned to a group by an external group. In other words, a subordinate group is categorized racially by a dominant group. In contrast, ethnic categories are assigned by members of the group to other members of the group without external influence (Baumann 2004; Berreman 1981). An ethnic group uses cultural characteristics to categorize itself. Ethnicity is also distinct from “class” insofar as class is based on attributes that are external to the group, including wealth, income, and occupation. In contrast, ethnicity is based on intrinsic characteristics that include cultural components.

Ethnicity has been defined in many ways by social scientists, including Anthropologists and Political Scientists. There is no consensus on how the concept should be defined, nor is there consensus regarding how ethnic groups are formed. Some definitions are broad; for example, Jones (1997, xiii) defines ethnicity as “all those social and psychological phenomena associated with a culturally constructed group identity.” Ethnicity has also been “associated with common ancestry and culture, including language, religion, traditions and behavioral norms that can contribute to and challenge a receiving nation’s world view” (Segal 2019, 140). Ethnicity has provided the foundation for understanding other concepts, including “ethnic identity.” Ethnic identity is “defined as ‘that aspect of a person’s self-conceptualization which results from identification with a broader group in opposition to theirs on the basis of perceived cultural differentiation and/or

common descent.” An ethnic group “is classified as ‘any group of people who set themselves apart and/or are set apart by others with whom they interact or co-exist on the basis of their perceptions of cultural differentiation and/or common ancestry” (Jones 1997, xiii). Within political science, and in the context of comparative politics, ethnic identities are often defined as a “subset of identity categories in which membership is determined by attributes associated with or believed to be associated with, descent (described here simply as descent-based attributes” (Chandra 2006, 397).

There are several debates surrounding ethnicity and how it should be understood by social scientists. In anthropology, two theories were developed to explain ethnicity. The instrumentalist or constructivist school of thought argues that among many possible common interests, ethnicity is the most effective at uniting people as they pursue access to political and economic resources (Hutchinson and Smith 1996; Yelvington 1991). The primordialist school of thought emphasizes that ethnicity creates emotional ties through family and develops naturally (Geertz 1963; Yelvington 1991). Over time, scholars have raised concerns about both schools of thought. One criticism is that primordialists view ethnicity as static and do not consider the possibility of cultural processes and other social factors that could affect and change ethnic communities over time. In contrast, instrumentalists are criticized for placing too much emphasis on accessing political and economic resources to the point where the psychological and cultural components of ethnicity are ignored in their analyses. Instrumentalists also assume that ethnic group members behave rationally or in ways that benefit their self-interests.

As a result of these and other critiques, some anthropologists have proposed alternative ways of thinking about ethnicity. One alternative is the practice theory first proposed by Bourdieu (1977). This theory suggests that ethnic identity is formed because of shared habits among a group of people, but it is not permanent and is constantly changing over time. Other anthropologists argue that practice theory has weaknesses and thus developed yet other alternative understandings of ethnicity. For example, Yelvington (1991) argues that ethnicity should be understood as a social identity that is built upon psycho-

logical and social practices, which are tied to identifying with ancestors who had shared characteristics. Yelvington thus argues that ethnic identity is formed by factors beyond the habitus. Still others contend that anthropologists and sociologists have placed too much emphasis on the cultural and social dimensions of ethnicity to the neglect of cognition as a measure of ethnic origin (Levine 1999).

Outside of social science, ethnicity (along with race) has been used in studies of public health, specifically in the context of racial health disparities. In studies of racial health disparities, definitions of race and ethnicity are reliant upon definitions provided by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB), which identifies five racial categories: American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Black or African American; Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander; and White. The OMB identifies two ethnic categories: "Hispanic or Latino and Not Hispanic or Latino" (Egede 2006). One critique of this measure of ethnicity is that it makes interpreting differences among ethnic groups very difficult. Along with race, ethnicity has also been used to explain the experiences of underrepresented and oppressed groups throughout the world.

NATASHA ALTEMA-McNEELY

References

- Baumann, Timothy. 2004. "Defining Ethnicity." *The SAA Archaeological Record* 4, no. 4: 12–14.
- Berberman, Gerald D. 1981. "Social Inequality: A Cross Cultural Approach." In *Social Inequality: Comparative and Developmental Approaches*, edited by G. Berberman, 3–40. New York: Academic Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chandra, Kanchan. 2006. "What is Ethnic Identity and Does it Matter?" *Annual Review of Political Science* 9: 397–424.
- Egede, Leonard E. 2006. "Race, Ethnicity, Culture, and Disparities in Health Care." *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 21, no. 6: 667–9.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1962. "The Integrative Revolution: Primordial Sentiments and Civil Politics in the New States." In *Old Societies and New States*, edited by C. Geertz, 105–57. New York: Free Press.
- Hale, Henry E. 2004. "Explaining Ethnicity." *Comparative Political Studies* 37, no. 4: 458–85.
- Hutchinson, John and Anthony D. Smith. 1996. "Introduction." In *Ethnicity*, edited by J. Hutchinson and A.D. Smith, 3–14. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jones, Sian. 1997. *The Archaeology of Ethnicity: Constructing Identities in the Past and Present*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Levine, Hal. B. 1999. "Reconstructing Ethnicity." *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 5 no. 2: 165–80.
- Segal, U.A. 2019. "Globalization, Migration and Ethnicity." *Public Health* 172: 135–42.
- Yelvington, Kevin A. 1991. "Ethnicity as Practice? A Comment on Bentley." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 33, no. 1: 158–68.

Further readings

- Gabbert, Wolfgang. 2006. "Concepts of Ethnicity." *Latin American and Caribbean Ethnic Studies* 1, no. 1: 85–103.
- Isaacs, H. 1974. "Basic Group Identity: Idols of the Tribe." *Ethnicity* 1: 15–41.

98. Exploitation

The concept of exploitation that has most profoundly shaped political theory and informed revolutionary struggles is the concept developed by Karl Marx (1975) in his critique of capitalism. Marx's critique was informed by the classical political economy of Adam Smith (1966) and David Ricardo (1971), particularly with respect to the labor theory of value and the presupposition that society is divided into a class that owns *the means of production* and a class that owns only their *capacity to work*. Marx sought to determine how the owning class accumulated wealth through their employment of workers, while the workers, the producers of wealth, remained poor.

Marx starts with the fact that the exchange of wages for work *appears* to be an equitable exchange. A worker exchanges her *labor-power* for \$10 dollars an hour for eight hours of work and the owner pays the worker \$80 dollars for the right to employ her for eight hours. If this were an exchange of equivalents, however, it would not explain how the owner derives more wealth than he invested in the purchase of materials (*constant capital*) and labor (*variable capital*) and employing workers to manufacture *commodities*. For Marx, additional wealth is not created by buying goods cheap and selling them dear. Rather, the increase in wealth appropriated by the owners derives from workers producing more value in the form of commodities than the value they are paid in wages for their labor. To cite our example, the worker paid \$80 dollars for eight hours of work produces the equivalent value of her wage in four hours, the period Marx calls *necessary labor time*, and the remainder of the day, or *surplus labor time*, she produces value for which she receives no compensation. Marx formulated the *rate of surplus-value* (S) as the ratio of surplus-value to variable capital (V). In the above case, the rate of surplus-value or, from the perspective of workers, the *intensity of exploitation* is \$80/\$80 or 100 percent. What appears to be an equal exchange entails workers giving more than they receive. As Marx (1977) writes in the chapter titled "The Sale and Purchase of Labor-Power," in *Capital Vol. 1*, everything changes upon leaving the *sphere of exchange* (often referred to as the "free

market") and descending to the *realm of production*. Whereas the former is the "very Eden of the innate rights of man," the basis of bourgeois ideas of freedom, equality, and fairness, the latter is where workers labor for free, that is, where capital exploits labor.

Driven by competition with other capitalists, every individual capitalist seeks to maximize the production of surplus-value, the source of profits and capital accumulation. They do so by lengthening the working day and shortening necessary labor time. Capitalists introduce new technologies and forms of organization and discipline to speed up production and they keep wages suppressed by maintaining a surplus of unemployed workers; using racism and sexism to justify lower pay for the same work; outsourcing production to deregulated, low-cost labor sites; employing publicly subsidized incarcerated labor; opposing unionization; and promoting racism and ethnonationalism to divide workers and enlist their support for capitalist domination (Allen 2022; Parenti 2011).

Though Marx focused primarily on the capital-wage relation, he also considered *primitive accumulation*, *slavery*, and *reproductive labor* as principal sources of wealth extraction and integral to the formation and perpetuation of capitalist relations of commodity production. European conquest and enslavement constituted the "dawn" of capitalist production (Galeano 1973; Rodney 1972; Williams 1994) and accumulation by dispossession, enslavement, and commodification remain fundamental to capitalist domination (Patnaik and Patnaik 2021). At the same time, the unpaid and largely female-gendered labor involved in the reproduction and maintenance of wage-labor was and remains central to capitalist exploitation (Davis 1981; Engels 2010; Federici 2020; Giménez 2019; Mies 1986). In addition, capitalists accumulate wealth through rents, publicly financed corporate subsidies, write-offs, and bailouts, and interest on debt, which with the dominance of finance capital, is a major source of accumulation on a world scale (Amin 2018).

Marx's theory of exploitation reveals class struggle at the heart of production and the structural connections between capital accumulation, patriarchy, racism, colonialism, debt, and ecological ruin, where nature, like labor, is viewed by capital solely as raw mate-

rial for commodity production. Marx's theory provides a basis for understanding how struggles against oppression and environmental ruin are integral to building working class power to contest capital and gain control over the means of production and organize the economy and our relations with nature to protect the material basis of life and support the development of all (Bellamy-Foster 2022; McAlevey 2020).

MARK D. WOOD

References

- Allen, Theodore. 2022. *The Invention of the White Race: The Origins of Racial Oppression*. London: Verso.
- Amin, Samin. 2018. *Modern Imperialism, Monopoly Finance Capital, and Marx's Law of Value*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Bellamy Foster, John. 2022. *Capitalism and the Anthropocene: Ecological Ruin or Ecological Revolution*. New York: New York University Press.
- Davis, Angela. 1981. *Women, Race & Class*. New York: Random House.
- Engels, Friedrich. 2010. *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, translated by Tristram Hunt. London: Penguin Books.
- Federici, Silvia. 2020. *Patriarchy of the Wage: Notes on Marx, Gender, and Feminism*. Oakland, CA: PM Press.
- Galeano, Eduardo. 1973. *The Open Veins of Latin America: Five Centuries of the Pillage of a Continent*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Giménez, Martha E. 2019. *Marx, Women, and Capitalist Social Reproduction: Marxist Feminist Essays*. Chicago: Haymarket Books.
- Marx, Karl. 1975. *Wage Labour and Capital and Value, Price, and Profit*. New York: International Publishers. New York: Ecco.
- Marx, Karl. 1977. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy. Vol. I*, translated by Ben Fowkes. New York: Vintage Books.
- McAlevey, Jane. 2020. *A Collective Bargain: Unions, Organizing, and the Fight for Democracy*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Mies, Maria. 1986. *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale: Women in the International Division of Labor*. New York: Zed Books.
- Parenti, Michael. 2011. *The Face of Imperialism*. London: Paradigm Publishers.
- Patnaik, Utsa, and Prabhat Patnaik. 2021. *Capital and Imperialism: Theory, History, and the Present*. New York: Monthly Review.
- Ricardo, David. 1971. *On the Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Rodney, Walter. 1972. *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. London: Bogle-L'Ouverture Publications.
- Smith, Adam. 1966. *Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. New York: Augustus M. Kelley.
- Thier, Hadas. 2020. *A People's Guide to Capitalism*. Chicago: Haymarket Books.
- Williams, Eric. 1994. *Capitalism and Slavery*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

99. Financialization

There is widespread recognition that a significant qualitative change has occurred in capitalist accumulation – “a secular transformation of the capitalist economy” (Lapavistas 2013, 21) – that goes beyond reference to an amorphous “neoliberalism,” although arguably this change has been a major driver and consequence of the latter. Analysis of financialization’s substance and impact transcends theoretical and disciplinary boundaries and encompasses the full spectrum of economic institutions and practices, from individuals and households to corporations and state-level actors.

Conservative commentator Kevin Phillips (1994, 92–102) appears to have coined the term “financialization” in two books, with the second of these books attributing the obstruction of political change in the United States to the “interlock between interest-group power and the political system.” Stockholders, and especially speculative finance, had become the primary beneficiaries of a deliberate policy that Phillips described as “financial mercantilism.” Simultaneously, world systems theorist and historian Giovanni Arrighi (1994) used the term to denote the cyclical process by which hegemonic powers decline, as finance usurps the industrial and commercial sectors that had powered the rise of these hegemonic powers.

Soon afterwards, *Business Week* economics editor Michael Mandel (1996, 8) identified the emergence of a risk society in which “workers, business, and countries must start thinking like investors in the financial markets, where the only way to consistently achieve success is to accept risk.” The transfer of risk to households has been the special focus of recent work on Australia, which assesses more generally applicable lessons regarding the means by which household finance is being transformed into a “personal hedge fund” as “people become further and further drawn into compliance with financial ways of thinking” (Bryan and Rafferty 2018, 12).

This Althusserian linkage of ideology with social practices forms the basis of sociologist Randy Martin’s ground-breaking study, *Financialization of Daily Life* (2002). Martin (2002, 43) argues that financialization “insinuates an orientation toward accounting and

risk management into all domains of life.” He also observes the coincidence of financialization in practice with the emergence of a theoretical literature on the risk society, associated especially with sociologists Ulrich Beck and Anthony Giddens. Yet, he (2002, 207n1) suggests “the phenomenon of financialization ... is treated as peripheral” in the latter literature, which instead points to a post-class knowledge-based economy that was central to the concurrent reinvention of social democratic political parties in which Giddens himself was involved.

Intensified structural emphasis on profit maximization enforces a regime in which financial markets have become the chief means of value extraction under the guise of the “shareholder value” doctrine that emerged in parallel with the regulatory unleashing of finance that began in the 1970s (Krippner 2011; Foroohar 2016). This has impacted corporate management to the extent that it might be reasonable to ask whether there is any longer such a thing as a non-financial corporation given that “financial sector demands dictate nonfinancial company behaviour” (Tabb 2012, 10). Claude Serfati regards what were once called non-financial corporations as today acting “as financial centres with industrial activities, or ‘as an organizational modality of finance capital’” in a formulation that recalls Rudolf Hilferding’s *Finance Capital* (Serfati 2008, 36). Financialization’s impact is argued to have not only “changed corporate governance but proven to be a form of redistributive growth” (Martin 2002, 10); it is “an appropriation from the rest of the economy” (Tabb 2012, 41–2). Regulationist analysis highlights this parasitical aspect by explaining how stock markets achieve value extraction, rather than financing value creation (Aglietta and Rebérioux 2005). This has negative implications for both long-term economic growth and the equitable distribution of income and wealth (Lazonick 2010).

Studies of the financial sector itself range from a focus on the explosive growth of derivative securities and their trading, such that any conceivable risk can form the basis of a hedging contract (Bryan and Rafferty 2006) to the more specific ways in which housing markets are entwined with the risk culture of banks amid a continuously growing quantity of debt (Lapavistas 2012; Roberts 2013). Regarding the political economy of development, feminist scholarship has high-

lighted the gendered use of microcredit as a means of enhancing its appeal to policy-makers as an instrument of economic development that empowers women, whilst in practice expanding opportunities for finance providers' profit-making (Girón 2015).

MICHAEL KEANEY

References

- Aglietta, Michel, and Antoine Rebérioux. 2005. *Corporate Governance Adrift: A Critique of Shareholder Value*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Arrighi, Giovanni. 1994. *The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power, and the Origins of our Times*. London: Verso.
- Bryan, Dick, and Michael Rafferty. 2006. *Capitalism with Derivatives: A Political Economy of Financial Derivatives, Capital and Class*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bryan, Dick, and Mike Rafferty. 2018. *Risking Together: How Finance is Dominating Everyday Life in Australia*. Sydney: Sydney University Press.
- Foroohar, Rana. 2016. *Makers and Takers: The Rise of Finance and the Fall of American Business*. New York: Crown Business.
- Girón, Alicia. 2015. "Women and Financialization: Microcredit, Institutional Investors, and MFIs." *Journal of Economic Issues* 49, no. 2: 373–96.
- Krippner, Greta. 2011. *Capitalizing on Crisis: The Political Origins of the Rise of Finance*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Lapavistas, Costas, ed. 2012. *Financialisation in Crisis*. Leiden and Boston, MA: Brill.
- Lapavistas, Costas. 2013. *Profiting Without Producing: How Finance Exploits Us All*. London: Verso.
- Lazonick, William. 2010. "Innovative Business Models and Varieties of Capitalism: Financialization of the U.S. Corporation." *Business History Review* 84, no. 4: 675–702.
- Mandel, Michael. 1996. *The High-Risk Society: Peril and Promise in the New Economy*. New York: Random House.
- Martin, Randy. 2002. *Financialization of Daily Life*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Phillips, Kevin. 1994. *Arrogant Capital: Washington, Wall Street, and the Frustration of American Politics*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Roberts, Adrienne. 2013. "Financing Social Reproduction: The Gendered Relations of Debt and Mortgage Finance in Twenty-First-Century America." *New Political Economy* 18, no. 1: 21–42.
- Serfati, Claude. 2008. "Financial Dimensions of Transnational Capital, Global Value Chain and Technological Innovation." *Journal of Innovation Economics and Management* 2, no. 2: 35–61.
- Tabb, William K. 2012. *The Restructuring of Capitalism in Our Time*. New York: Columbia University Press.

See also

Critical Political Economy; Power Structure Analysis; World Systems Analysis; Paul M. Sweezy

100. Gender

Critical frameworks view gender as an oppressive set of political constructions that vary according to history, culture, and region. U.S. gender studies grew in the 1970s as a reaction to the white European male point of view predominant in political science that disregarded gender in their social analyses. As feminist scholars point out, the “universal subject” depicted in many classical and modern political philosophy texts only reflect the experiences of white Western men. Critical gender studies covers a wide variety of disciplines including feminist theory, Marxism, poststructuralism, critical race theory, queer theory, and men’s studies.

The first mainstream approach viewed gender as a set of socially constructed norms, behaviors, and expectations associated with being a man or woman that change across time and place. According to philosopher Simone de Beauvoir (1956, 273), “one is not born, but rather becomes, a woman.” Normative gender identities of femininity and masculinity are imposed onto natural bodies through processes of socialization and internalization. Gayle Rubin (1975, 158) describes these processes as “a systematic social apparatus which takes up females as raw materials and fashions domesticated women as products.” Women (especially among the white middle class) are socialized to become gentle, submissive, and passive alongside other “feminine” traits valued in domestic roles. Likewise, men must comport themselves towards “masculine” characteristics such as aggressiveness, rationality, and physical strength. As Kate Millet (1969, 31) illustrates, gender identities are “the sum total of the parents’, the peers’, and the culture’s notions of what is appropriate to each gender by way of temperament, character, interests, status, worth, gesture, and expression.” These learned gender roles subjugate women by fashioning them into what de Beauvoir (1956) terms the “Other”: inanimate objects only recognizable in relation to male subjectivity. This social constructionist view challenged prevailing biological-essentialist understandings of gender as a natural, organic category that exists prior to social institutions.

During the renaissance of Marxist critique in the 1960s, scholars drew on Marxist theory to analyse gender through the prism of

economic relationships. Contrary to the discursive forms of domination central to social constructionist theories, Marxist feminism asserts that capitalist modes of production and private property drive gendered oppression (Hartmann 1979). These thinkers distinguish work between productive labor carried out by men and unpaid invisible labor such as child-bearing and pregnancy carried out by women, thus creating a “sexual division of labor” between the sexes. According to Shulamith Firestone (1970, 5, 10–11), these reproductive differences create a “sexual class system” that can only be abolished through a women-led revolution aimed at “the full restoration to women of ownership of their own bodies.” Lise Vogel’s (1983) concept of social reproduction points out that women’s exploited domestic labor generates the workforce necessary to maintain capitalist societies. This exploitation was the basis for a demand of “wages for housework” by activists like Silvia Federici (1975) in the 1970s. Marxist articulations of gender argue that consciousness-raising along with overthrowing capitalist forms of production are necessary to liberate society from gendered domination. Many have criticized Marxist conceptions of gender for subordinating questions of race, gender, sexuality, and other social differences to economic class.

In the 1990s, poststructuralist readings of gender emerged in response to mainstream feminist scholarship that reified gender relations into universal categories corresponding to a heterosexual male-female binary. Judith Butler (1990) promotes an anti-essentialist view of gender as an unstable, historically contingent identity performed through behavior. Butler’s theory of gender performativity suggests that subjectivities are made legible through scripted gender behaviors that one *does* on a day-to-day basis. Butler’s (1993) work destabilized the biological essentialism versus social constructionist debate by stating that gender is not something impressed onto natural, pre-social bodies but that both sex *and* gender are normatively constructed. According to Butler (1990, 7), “gender is not to culture as sex is to nature; gender is also the discursive/cultural means by which ‘natural sex’ is produced and established as ‘prediscursive,’ prior to culture.” Butler alongside other queer theorists such as Michael Warner, Adrienne Rich, and Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick have challenged the “heterosexual culture”

naturalized in early social constructionist views that categorize individuals into one of two gender identities based on their biological sexual characteristics.

Gender anti-essentialism was as well pioneered by Black feminist theorists. These thinkers emphasize gender as an unproductive analytic category in isolation and must be understood in relation to other social identities such as race, ethnicity, class, and sexuality. bell hooks notes that the experiences of privileged white women have dominated mainstream gender frameworks and suppressed the voices of women of color, immigrant women, and working-class women (hooks 1984). Like hooks, Kimberle Crenshaw's (1991) theory of intersectionality explores how intersections between gender and racial identities produce complex forms of oppression illegible through the separate concepts of sexual discrimination or race discrimination. Gender studies must embrace race, class, and other forms of difference rather than using universalizing language that implicitly assumes a white middle-class subject position.

KATIE TEMPLE

References

- de Beauvoir, Simone. 1956. *The Second Sex*. Translated by H. M. Parshley. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, Judith. 1993. *Bodies That Matter*. New York: Routledge.
- Crenshaw, Kimberle. 1991. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review* 43, no. 6 (July): 1241–99.
- Federici, Silvia. 1975. *Wages Against Housework*. Bristol, UK: Falling Wall Press.
- Firestone, Shulamith. 1970. *The Dialectic of Sex*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Hartmann, Heidi. 1979. "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a More Progressive Union." *Capital and Class* 3, no. 2: 1–33.
- hooks, bell. 1984. *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*. Boston: South End Press.
- Millet, Kate. 1969. *Sexual Politics*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Rubin, Gayle. 1975. "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex." In *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, edited by Rayna R. Reiter, 157–210. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Vogel, Lise. 1983. *Marxism and the Oppression of Women*. Boston: Brill.

101. General strike

General strikes have become more common in the past few decades, which makes it important to understand the different types of general strikes, as well as how and why they occur in modern capitalist societies. In 1906, German Marxist Rosa Luxemburg described the general strike as a social revolt. These revolts occur when workers escalate their tactics to walk off the job *en masse* and shut down production across a specific geographic area or industry. They may alternatively take over the geographic area or industry and attempt to directly govern themselves as a factory council. When general strikes spread throughout society, they become a revolutionary attempt to take over, re-organize, and run society through direct democracy.

In the past decade alone, general strikes have taken place in Guadeloupe and Martinique (2009), Puerto Rico (1998, 2019), India (2016, 2020, 2022), Belarus (2020), Sri Lanka (2022), Italy (2022), and Palestine (2022, as well as 1936), to name only a few. Although known to have occurred during antiquity in Egypt and Greece, general strikes became more common in the nineteenth century including Kansas City, Toledo, St. Louis and East St. Louis, Missouri (1877), Italy (1904), Finland (1905, 1917 and 1956), Seattle (1919), five city-wide general strikes in Springfield, Illinois, Kansas City, Missouri, Waco, Texas, and two in Billings, Montana (1917–18), United Kingdom (1926), Norway (1921), and Oakland, California (1946). For the past century scholars have been analysing general strikes to understand what they are and why they occur.

According to Rosa Luxemburg's classic work on the general strike, "The Mass Strike, the Political Party, and the Trade Unions" (Luxemburg in Hudis and Rein, 2022), the general strike is a social revolt by a large part of a population in a specific geographic area, whether a city, province, or country, in which workers refuse to work and shut down workplaces and the economy. The types of general strikes vary. Some general strikes shut down production in the area while in others workers take over and run the workplace and implement a system of self-governance that extends beyond the waged workplace. For example, during the five-day 1919 Seattle general strike workers published a news-

paper, operated collective kitchens, provided trash and water services, carried out self-defense, oversaw operation of the hospital, and made decisions collectively through the General Strike Committee (Strong et al. 1919; Ovetz 2019a, Ovetz 2019b; Seattle General Strike Project n.d.) Scholars have found that a general strike can become a revolutionary moment by disrupting capitalist accumulation and control during which time the population experiments with new ways of organizing life and providing for basic necessities and self-governance (O'Connor 1964).

A general strike differs from a factory or workplace takeover by striking workers who run it through a factory council as happened in Italy (1919–20), Hungary (1954), and Argentina (2001 to present). In these cases, although the revolt was generalized throughout the economy there was no attempt at self-governance in all of society with the goal of replacing the existing government.

While there is no definitive explanation of how or why workers carry out a general strike there are several in-depth histories and analyses of why and how they occur. Among the studies of specific general strikes are Burbank's (Burbank 1966) and Kruger's (Kruger 2021) histories of the 1919 St. Louis and East St. Louis general strikes. Historical accounts of the Winnipeg General Strike include the graphic novel by the Graphic History Collective (Graphic History Collective 2019), and histories by Aivalis, Penner, and The Winnipeg Defence Committee (2019), and Dupuis (2014). There are a number of historical accounts of the 1926 U.K. general strike including Symons (1957), Phillips (1976), and Laybourn (1996). Friedheim (1918) and Winslow (2020) offer historical examinations of the 1919 Seattle general strike. Brecher (1972), Foner (1977), and Ovetz (2019b) show how workers effectively organized across boundaries and overcame divisions to unite against employers during the 1877 general railroad strike in the U.S.

Aside from an historical event, the general strike is also understood as a tactic workers select from what Tilly (1978 and 2003) called a "tactical repertoire." During the Seattle general strike Ovetz (2019a and b) found that workers in the city tactically escalated from localized strikes and conflicts by circulating the struggle throughout society in order to take over and run the city. This

effort is understood as an effort by workers to transcend capitalism by taking over and running society using direct democracy in the workplace, what anarchist theorist Rudolph Rocker (2004) called “anarcho syndicalism.”

ROBERT OVETZ

References

- Aivalis, Christo, Norman Penner, and The Winnipeg Defence Committee. 2019. *Winnipeg 1919: The Strikers' Own History of the General Strike*. Toronto: James Lorimer & Company Ltd., Publishers.
- Brecher, Jeremy. 1972. *Strike!* San Francisco: Straight Arrow Books.
- Burbank, David. 1966. *Reign of the Rabble: The St. Louis General Strike of 1877*. New York: Augustus M. Kelley.
- Dupuis, Michael. 2014. *Winnipeg's General Strike: Reports from the Front Lines*. Charleston, SC: The History Press.
- Foner, Philip S. 1977. *The Great Labor Uprising of 1877*. New York: Pathfinder Press.
- Friedheim, Robin. 2018. *The Seattle General Strike*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Graphic History Collective. 2019. *1919: A Graphic History of the Winnipeg General Strike*. Toronto: Between the Lines.
- Hudis, Peter and Sandra Rein, eds. 2022. *The Complete Works of Rosa Luxemburg Volume IV, Political Writings 2, On Revolution (1906–1909)*. London: Verso.
- Kruger, Mark. 2021. *The St. Louis Commune of 1877: Communism in the Heartland*. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press.
- Laybourn, Keith. 1996. *The General Strike Day by Day*. Stroud, England: A. Sutton.
- Morris, Margaret. 1980. *The General Strike*. London: The Journeyman Press.
- O'Connor, Harvey. 1964. *Revolution in Seattle: A Memoir*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Ovetz, Robert. 2019a. “When Workers Ran the City: The 1919 Seattle General Strike,” *ROAR*, February 6, <https://roarmag.org/essays/seattle-general-strike-1919/>.
- Ovetz, Robert. 2019b. *When Workers Shot Back: Class Conflict from 1877 to 1921*. Chicago: Haymarket Press.
- Phillips, G. A. 1976. *The General Strike: The Politics of Industrial Conflict*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Rocker, Rudolf. 2004. *Anarcho-Syndicalism: Theory and Practice*, Oakland, CA: AK Press.
- Seattle General Strike Project, University of Washington, <https://depts.washington.edu/labhist/strike/gold.shtml>.
- Strong, Anna Louise, and Central Labor Council of Seattle and Vicinity, ed. 1919. *The Seattle General Strike: An Account of What Happened in Seattle and Especially in the Seattle Labor Movement, During the General Strike, February 6 to 11, 1919*. Seattle: Seattle Union Record Pub. Co.
- Symons, Julian. 1957. *The General Strike*. United Kingdom: The Cresset Press.
- Tilly, Charles. 1978. *From Mobilization to Revolution*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Tilly, Charles. 2003. *Politics of Collective Violence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Unbreakable: The Spirit of the Strike, A Digital Exhibit Commemorating the 100th Anniversary of the Winnipeg General Strike*, <https://1919strike.lib.umanitoba.ca/>.
- Winslow, Cal. 2020. *Radical Seattle: The General Strike of 1919*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Woodcock, Jamie. January 10, 2019. “India General Strike 2019.” *Notes From Below*. <https://notesfrombelow.org/article/india-general-strike-2019>.

See also

Capitalist Class; Council Communism; Direct Action; Diversity of Tactics; Dual Power; Mass Strike; Proletariat; Ruling Class; Syndicalism

102. Hegemony

The concept of hegemony is largely attributed to the Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci, who deployed it extensively in his *Prison Notebooks* (1971), although he adopted the concept from the Russian Revolutionaries (1905, 1917), who had used it earlier. In fact, the word goes back many centuries, but only in the twentieth century did it become a crucial word in the art and science of politics.

The term originates from the ancient Greek *hēgemonia*, which connotes authority, rule, or political supremacy, while the related word *hēgemōn* meant leader. The word hegemony had a positive connotation for the ancient Greeks insofar as it was opposed to despotism and designated the political-military capacity to impose dominance, a superiority that while obtained through force, was sustained through a certain degree of (relative) acceptance of domination, and as a result of political, ideological, cultural, or technological-scientific superiority. At the same time, in ancient Greece, its meaning oscillated between a version charged more towards centralism and the power of force (represented by Sparta) and a “federalist” and “democratic” version (the Athenian model). The concept largely disappeared in Roman times as the Greek term hegemony was replaced with Latin *imperium* (Anderson 2021).

In the centuries that followed the fall of the Roman Empire, the concept of hegemony remained on the margins of political thought and appeared only in encyclopedias and in the writings of classical Greece and Rome. However, the concept of hegemony would reappear in the twentieth century to occupy a central place in political theory. A crucial moment in this conceptual flowering was the recovery and projection given to it by Marxism in the first 30 years of the century. It was the Bolsheviks who reintroduced the concept of hegemony before, during, and after the two Russian revolutions (1905 and 1917) to express the need for the working class to join with the peasantry in a coalition that would guarantee their supremacy and at the same time consensually lead the socialist revolution and the building of a classless society.

First Georgi Plekhanov, and later Alexander Bogdanov, Nicolai Bukharin, and Grigory Zinoviev, and also V.I. Lenin, all placed this word at the heart of an ideological formulation that served as the basis for the Marxist who most brilliantly managed to reshape the concept of hegemony: the Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci (Brandist 2016). Gramsci became familiar with the word during his stay in Moscow (1922–23) in his capacity as leader of the Italian Communist Party. When he took up the notion again, he attributed it substantially – that is to say, beyond nominal use – to Lenin, insofar as he had given the concept a particular understanding and application, with a democratic tone, to the notion of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This was applied in the formulation of the New Economic Policy in Russia and the strategy of the united front in Western Europe. According to Gramsci, both were political lines that implied a hegemonic method of conceiving relations and convergence between the subaltern classes, their conceptions of the world, and their organizations.

Gramsci first deployed the concept of hegemony in his *Prison Notebooks* (1971). While the term hegemony appears many times in the *Prison Notebooks*, Gramsci never explicitly defines the concept, although most scholars agree that it refers to the political, ideological, and cultural domination or *leadership* of one class or group over its allies and other subaltern groups in society. Importantly, for Gramsci, hegemony is a constantly shifting balance between consent and coercion that must be reproduced by the ruling class on a day-to-day basis. Hegemony is not a fixed or static equilibrium, but a dynamic equilibrium with openings for allied or subaltern groups to contest that hegemony through class struggle at every site and level in a mode of production.

Thus, Gramsci developed the idea of hegemony based on the premise that the constitution of an autonomous (revolutionary) political subject is based on the articulation of what he called *subaltern classes and groups* and the exercise of ideological and organizational autonomy with respect to the ruling classes. Under these conditions, it was possible to contest and dispute the hegemony of the bourgeoisie and oppose it with an hegemonic alternative economic, social, and political order (Cospito 2021). Gramsci

would forge a useful concept for the analysis of all forms of exercise of power centered on the principle of consensus over that of coercion by assuming that politics is a correlation of forces in a permanent struggle of contending hegemonies; one existing and the other one possible.

From this point of view, Gramsci would develop a sophisticated theorization of the Western State – that is, the advanced capitalist countries – as an integral State within which the political society (the State as an apparatus) and the civil society (the State as a social relation) were intertwined. Gramsci argued that it is in civil society where the apparatuses of hegemony find their most penetrating expression by generating a form of culture and common sense in accordance with the ideology of the ruling classes. Gramsci argued that even in defeat, and especially in defeat, socialist revolutionaries had to resume the thread of a strategy that would contest the trenches of civil society through a war of positions; a siege that would generate the prerequisites and necessary conditions to launch

a war of movement, the decisive assault on the fortified citadel of state power. In this sense, Gramsci advocated for the construction of a collective will, a national popular political movement structured by organic intellectuals capable of promoting a cultural battle, not only as a premise but as the very content of the revolutionary transformation. It was thanks to the conceptual development of Gramsci that the notion of hegemony was installed in the field of political theory and was even reinforced in the study of international relations and geopolitics.

MASSIMO MODONESI

References

- Anderson, Perry. 2021. *The H-Word. The Peripeteia of Hegemony*. London: Verso.
- Brandist, Craig 2016. *The Dimensions of Hegemony: Language, Culture and Politics in Revolutionary Russia*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Cospito, Giuseppe. 2021. *Egemonia. Da Omero ai Gender Studies*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Gramsci, Antonio. 2011. *Prison Notebooks*. New York: Columbia University Press.

103. Ideology

The Enlightenment philosopher and French revolutionary Destutt de Tracy coined the term “ideology” to describe a new “science of ideas” based on the principle that ordinary people could comprehend reality and need not rely on the authority of the church and king (Kennedy 1979). Tracy’s revolutionary party, the Ideologues, fought for democracy not only in France, but also as a universal principle. According to a compatriot of Tracy, “*Ideology* they told me would change the face of the earth, and that is exactly why those who wish the world to always remain stupid (and with good cause) detest ideology and the ideologues” (quoted in Kennedy 1979, 357–8). Napoleon Bonaparte soon provided a counter-definition worthy of the counter-revolution. He accused Tracy and the Ideologues of harming France by destabilizing traditional authorities with their “shadowy metaphysics.” Regarding ideology, he asked, “who destroyed respect for and the sanctity of laws by describing them not as sacred principles of justice, but only as the will of an assembly composed of men ignorant of civil, criminal, administrative, political, and military law?” (quoted in Kennedy 1979, 358–9). In America, the Founding Fathers replicated this French debate: the Ideologues influenced Thomas Jefferson’s vision of republican government, while John Adams shared Napoleon’s perception of “the people” as irrational “Idiologians” (quoted in Strath 2013, 5).

The history of ideology can be understood in terms of three concepts of ideology that originate in the debate between Tracy and Napoleon. The first two concepts come from Tracy and the Ideologues: (1) ideology is understood as a descriptive and explanatory science of politics; (2) ideology provides a critical, democratic, and emancipatory perspective on society. The third meaning emerges from Napoleon’s usage, but expands it beyond counter revolution to include political quiescence; (3) ideologies are abstract, speculative ideals that destabilize political orders, ignore practical politics, and/or reinforce social conformity. Historically, variations on Napoleon’s derogatory usage of ideology have arguably predominated (Love 2006).

Historically, ideology originated in modern western societies. The possibility of general – and generalizable – knowledge of political affairs and the mobilization of mass publics accompanied the development of capitalist economies, democratic politics, and secular societies in Europe. The traditional ideologies – liberalism, conservatism, socialism, anarchism, and fascism – have been enabled and constrained by the European nation-state system. Conflicts between nation states advocating these political ideologies earned the twentieth century the label, the “age of ideology” (Kramnick 1979). With globalization, the meaning of ideology is changing in as yet uncertain ways. Manfred Steger argues that ideologies previously structured by national imaginaries are fragmenting, a phenomenon revealed in their proliferating prefixes, alter-, anti-, neo-, post-, and proto-. This proliferation of prefixes is accompanied by the development of new global ideologies, such as feminism and environmentalism that invoke a new global imaginary (Steger 2009).

The first – descriptive and explanatory – usage of ideology has dominated the writings of political scientists from the early twentieth century to the present. Political scientists typically understand ideology as “a set of closely related beliefs, or ideas, or even attitudes characteristic of a group or community” (Plamenatz 1970). Political scientists’ studies of ideology emphasize electoral politics and public opinion, locate ideologies on a right/left political spectrum, and survey the ideologies of individuals, movements, and parties. The now classic study is Phillip Converse’s 1964 essay, “Belief Systems in Mass Publics,” which defines ideologies as belief systems whose core concepts exhibit coherence and constraint (Converse 1964). This approach associates political ideologies with popular simplifications of philosophical ideas (Ashcraft 1980). Political scientists’ empirical studies of ideologies have led some scholars to lament the loss of critical and emancipatory potential (Leopold 2013).

Karl Marx’s concept of ideology, a term he adopted from Tracy, dominates the second – critical and emancipatory – conception of ideology. Marx gives ideology three distinct, though overlapping, meanings (Wood 2012). First, Marx specifically refers to the German idealists as ideologists in order to distinguish their philosophical idealism from his historical materialism. Second, Marx defines

ideology as “superstructure” and “false consciousness,” an illusory worldview that reinforces existing relationships of class rule. Here Marx focuses on how ideology sustains class societies by fetishizing capitalism and exploitation as natural rather than historical phenomena. Third, Marx offers a broader account of ideology as ideas with a material basis. This understanding of ideology not only explains the ideologies of class-based societies, but also allows the possibility of a socialist ideology with an emancipatory worldview. Later Marxists have further developed these analyses of ideology with concepts such as reification (Lukacs 1972), hegemony (Gramsci 1971), ideological state apparatuses (Althusser 2014), and one-dimensionality (Marcuse 1991), among others.

The third use of ideology as conformist, irrelevant, or dangerous speculation is most commonly associated with defenses of traditional world views. Like Napoleon, many contemporary conservatives resist the label “ideology” for their political ideas. They argue that ideologies simplify complex realities, inflame popular passions, and undermine established orders. Samuel Huntington describes conservatism as a “nonideational ideology” whose substance is “the articulate, systematic, theoretical resistance to change” (Huntington 1957, 461). Another conservative, Michael Oakeshott, contrasts this “conservative disposition” with the dogmatism and perfectionism of political ideologies (Oakeshott 1982). This third usage is no longer confined to conservative critiques of ideology, however. In *Ideology and Utopia*, Karl Mannheim distinguishes ideologies which reinforce the status quo from utopias which envision another world order (Mannheim 2020).

A critical political science should focus on the structure of ideologies as well as definitions of them. Mainstream political science understands ideologies in linear terms compatible with the right/left political spectrum and its liberal center: ideologies offer a critique of the existing order, a vision of a future order, and a plan to get from here to there. More recently, a morphological approach to ideologies has become increasingly prominent, especially among historians of ideas. Morphologically, ideologies have a core concept around which adjacent and peripheral concepts are arrayed (Freeden 1998). Adjacent concepts tend to be logically related

to the core and crucial for the structural integrity of an ideology. Peripheral concepts are frequently culturally and historically contingent and less fundamental to the ideology. A morphological approach analyses ideologies in historical context, including how their contested concepts shape political debates. In the process, it also challenges the distinction between philosophical sophistication and ideological simplifications. Most important, it presents ideologies as fundamental features of democratic politics, and hence, as central to a critical political science.

NANCY S. LOVE

References

- Ashcraft, Richard. 1980. “Political Theory and the Problem of Ideology.” *Journal of Politics* 42, no. 3: 687–721.
- Converse, Phillip. 1964. “The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics.” In *Ideology and Discontent*, ed. David Apter, 206–61. New York: Free Press.
- Freeden, Michael. 1998. *Ideologies and Political Theory: A Conceptual Approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Huntington, Samuel. 1957. “Conservatism as an Ideology.” *American Political Science Review* 51, no. 2 (June): 454–73.
- Kennedy, Emmet. 1979. *A Philosopher in the Age of Revolution: Destutt de Tracy and the Origins of Ideology*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
- Kramnick, Isaac and Frederick M. Watkins. 1979. *The Age of Ideologies – Political Thought, 1750 to the Present*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Leopold, David. 2013. “Marxism and Ideology: From Marx to Althusser.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Political Ideologies*, eds. Michael Freedon, Lyman Tower Sargent, Marc Stears, 20–37. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Love, Nancy S. 2006. *Understanding Dogmas and Dreams: A Text*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage/CQ Press.
- Mannheim, Karl. 2020. *Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*, edited by Edward Shills and translated by Louis Wirth. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Oakeshott, Michael. 1982. “On Being Conservative.” In *The Portable Conservative Reader*, edited by Russell Kirk, 567–99. New York: Viking Penguin.
- Plamenatz, John. 1970. *Ideology*. New York: Praeger.
- Steger, Manfred. 2009. *The Rise of the Global Imaginary: Political Ideologies from the French Revolution to the Global War on Terror*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Strath, Bo. 2013. "Ideology and Conceptual History." In *The Oxford Handbook of Political Ideologies*, edited by Michael Freeden, Lyman Tower Sargent, and Marc Stears, 3–19. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wood, Allen. 2012. *Karl Marx*. New York: Routledge.

Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, edited by Quintin Hoare. New York: International Publishers.

Laclau, Ernesto and Chantal Mouffe. 1985. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Toward a Radical Democratic Politics*. New York: Verso.

Lukacs, Georg. 1972. *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.

Marcuse, Herbert. 1991. *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Capitalist Society*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Further readings

Althusser, Louis. 2014. *On the Reproduction of Capitalism: Ideology and Ideological State Apparatus*. London: Verso.

See also

Ideology Critique; Hegemony; Intellectuals

104. Immigration

Immigration into a destination country occurs when non-citizens move from a country of origin on a more permanent basis versus, for instance, visiting as a tourist or business traveler. In contrast to immigration, emigration is the act of leaving one's country of origin to enter into another country. There are multiple immigration statuses that may be assigned to non-citizens, typically with visa regimes (i.e., work visas, student visas, etc.) or with permanent residence status (i.e., green card). "Legal immigrants" are those who have been granted permission by the nation-state to stay in the country, whereas "unauthorized immigrants" are non-citizens who have not been granted this permission by the nation-state. The United States has experienced multiple immigration waves with each seemingly becoming more restrictive and punitive toward immigrants.

Since its inception, and eventual codification, the immigration system in the United States has favored white, English-speaking, Anglo-European settlers, who shared a common religious background in Protestant Christianity (Walia 2021). Since the first wave of immigration and British colonization in the 1700s, immigrants, except for enslaved Africans, were accepted as a homogenous group. However, anti-immigrant backlash first began with the Irish due to their poverty and Catholic religion, and then with the Chinese and/or Asian populations, who were similarly "othered" despite them being part of the labor force used in building the transcontinental railroads and in mining operations. Starting in 1875, a series of restrictions on immigration were implemented by the United States, which not only targeted migration from China and banned immigration from most Asian countries, but also "included bans on criminals, people with contagious diseases, polygamists, anarchists, beggars and importers of prostitutes" (Cohn 2015).

Ellis Island in New York was the first federal immigration center and this phase of immigration (1892–1924) witnessed an increase of immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe as well as a rise in xenophobia among American citizens and public officials. The fears among white Protestants were similar to the previous anti-immigrant backlash, where immigrants from Southern and

Eastern Europe were perceived to be a potential threat to Anglo-American homogeneity due to their different cultures, religions, and languages. In response to this fear, the U.S. Congress began implementing a new series of immigration restrictions, which imposed numerical quotas based on nationality in an attempt to restore earlier immigration patterns. In 1921, the Immigration Quota Act capped annual immigration at 350,000 per year and set a numerical quota limit for each country. The Immigration Act of 1924 made the quotas stricter and permanent by reducing the total number per year to 150,000 and limited the number of immigrants that could be admitted to the U.S. to 2 percent of the total number of individuals from each nationality that resided in the United States in 1890. This measure was a legislative expression of xenophobia in that choosing 1890 as the year by which to set quotas was before the waves of Southern and Eastern Europeans (Italian, Greek, Polish, Russian) immigrants arrived in the United States (Martin 2011). In contrast, the 1921 law had set quotas based on the 1910 foreign-born populations of each nationality and, thus, would have been more favorable to Southern and Eastern Europeans. This time period also saw the growth of an immigration enforcement bureaucracy with the creation of the U.S. Border Patrol in 1924.

The immigration laws in place that explicitly allowed for racial and ethnic discrimination were not changed until the 1965 Immigration and Naturalization Act, which coincided with the latest wave of immigration, now primarily from Latin America and South/East Asia. National origin quotas and bans on Asian entry were replaced with an immigration regime that now emphasized family reunification, "skilled" immigrants (professionals, scientists), and a new quota for refugees (Lopez, Passel, and Rohal 2015). It is important to note that although this new law eliminated national origin quotas, it imposed the first limits on immigration from the Western Hemisphere (i.e. Latin America, including Mexico). Some scholars (Massey and Pren 2012) argue that this change in the immigration law and the end of the Bracero Program caused an increase in "unauthorized" immigration. From this point forward, in the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s, new immigration laws principally focused on the growing numbers of refugees, "unauthorized" immigration, and strengthening border

security (Lopez, Passel, and Rohal 2015), which tended to render immigrants from these regions racialized, criminal “others.”

Overall, the two main intersecting concepts in the story of immigration to the United States revolve around assimilation and nativism. The classic theory of assimilation as proposed by Warner and Srole (1945), for instance, was an enduring myth based on the first waves of immigrants to the U.S., “about the inevitability of assimilation into the melting pot of American life” (Massey 1997, 634). The composition of this “melting pot,” however, as discussed above, was white, Anglo-Saxon Protestants. Thus, these accounts of assimilation were blatantly discriminatory and racist, and effectively defined a racially stratified hierarchy, where other ethnic groups had to unlearn “inferior” cultural traits vis-à-vis white, English-speaking Protestants to be fully accepted into American society (Alba and Nee 1997). As subsequent waves of “other” immigrants began to move to the U.S., nativist sentiments formed in a combination of racism and nationalism, where previous inhabitants feared the loss of power and control over local communities and the nation. As Massey (1997, 632) notes, the nativist sentiments were based on a “fear of cultural change and a deep-seated worry that European Americans will be displaced from their dominant position in American life.” These narratives (re)produced and reinforced an immigration system where policies and practices depend on the distinction between the right kind of immigrant versus the deviant other.

CARLA ANGULO-PASEL

References

- Alba, Richard, and Victor Nee. 1997. “Rethinking Assimilation Theory for a New Era of Immigration.” *International Migration Review* 31, no. 4: 826–74.
- Cohn, D’Vera. 2015. *How U.S. Immigration Laws and Rules Have Changed through History*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/09/30/how-us-immigration-laws-and-rules-have-changed-through-history/.
- Lopez, Mark Hugo, Jeffrey Passel, and Molly Rohal. 2015. “The Nation’s Immigration Laws, 1920 to Today.” In *Modern Immigration Wave Brings 59 Million to U.S., Driving Population Growth and Change through 2065*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.
- Martin, Susan F. 2011. *A Nation of Immigrants*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Massey, Douglas S. 1997. “The New Immigration and Ethnicity in the United States.” *Population and Development Review* 21, no. 3: 631–52.
- Massey, Douglas S., and Karen A. Pren. 2012. “Unintended Consequences of US Immigration Policy: Explaining the Post-1965 Surge from Latin America.” *Population and Development Review* 38, no. 1: 1–29.
- Walia, Harsha. 2021. *Border and Rule: Global Migration, Capitalism, and the Rise of Racist Nationalism*. Chicago: Haymarket Books.
- Warner, W.L., and L. Srole. 1945. *The Social Systems of American Ethnic Groups*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Further readings

- Jones, Maldwyn A. 1992. *American Immigration*, 2nd edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Massey, Douglas S., ed. 2021. “Immigration, Nativism & Race in the United States.” *Daedalus: Journal of the American Academy of Arts & Sciences* 150, no. 2: 219.
- Ngai, Mae M. 2014. *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

105. Indigenous movements

The origin of Indigenous movements begins with a debate on the status of Indigenous groups. Rooted in the crusades that concluded in the thirteenth century, the “heathens and infidels” justification for war was applied to Indigenous peoples; thus, calling into question their very humanness (Getches 2011, 46). The history of Indigenous movements is rich and commences the day colonial actors attempted to divest them of access to their traditional homelands. Indigenous peoples have worked to maintain a good relationship with their traditional homeland (Holm, Pearson, and Chavis 2003). However, the very use of the word “movement” goes a long way toward disregarding the foundation for Indigenous responsibility toward protecting their homelands (Lerma 2014).

At the core of nearly every Indigenous movement is a belief in the human rights of the group. Even this focus on a group became controversial. While it may be more convenient to focus on the rights of an individual within a larger society, Indigenous rights advocates have pushed to bring the group into focus, which complicates matters (Anaya 2009, 55–132). The context for Indigenous human rights should be understood within the frame of various acts to eliminate Indigenous peoples from the planet. Aside from war and removal, colonial actors have long worked to “civilize” Indigenous peoples through the guise of education. This often meant that individual Indians and their children were removed from their homes by force and sent to boarding schools where they endured the loss of their culture over the course of an academic year (Lomawaima and McCarthy 2006). Many children never returned home and died at times under unknown circumstances. The magnitude of this tragedy is only today being investigated (Lerma 2021). There are many unanswered questions, in the English language, on Indigenous genocide through Latin America and the depopulation can only be surmised through alternate lenses such as economic development (Mahoney 2010).

One of the earliest examples of a movement recognizing Indigenous human rights was led by Levi General Deskaheh through

the League of Nations in 1922–24 (Anaya 2009, 4–7). By the 1920s, many colonial actors were pushing to essentially eliminate Indigenous nations and, specifically, their norms for leadership founded within traditional mechanisms of self-governance. In short, colonial actors were pushing to incorporate Indigenous populations into their state; thus, denying the reality of the group in exchange for a focus on individual rights protected under the cloak of the colonial nation (Lerma 2014, 23–46). The role of international norms intersecting with Indigenous human rights is an area of study needing more attention. In short, it is clear that gaining support from many nations can go a long way toward advancing Indigenous led movements by holding hegemonic colonial actors to account for their actions in suppressing Indigenous peoples (Anaya 2009, 7). The “norm, policy, or rule,” then, is how do Indigenous movement leaders embarrass colonial actors so as to increase the probability that the human rights of Indigenous peoples are respected (Goertz 2003).

In the twenty-first century, there are several movements crossing tribal boundaries in pursuit of a pan-Indigenous collective interest. For example, Idle No More (INM) is a movement characterized by an Indigenous founded reaction to the Canadian federal governments’ “Jobs and Growth Act,” which appears to disregard Indigenous sovereignty. A mere six months later, the INM evolved into a broad-based coalition focused on the entirety of Indigenous based grievances (Coulthard 2014, 24). Similarly, the No DAPL movement was an international undertaking to stop the transport of oil through the Standing Rock reservation and potentially poisoning the entirety of the Missouri river for all humans regardless of indigeneity. The most recent movement involves Missing and Murdered Indigenous Peoples (MMIP). This movement has evolved to speak for women, children, men, gender fluid members of society, and so on, with a connection to an Indigenous community. Some within the MMIP movement tie this problem back to Pocahontas as well as spanning many identities to include the rash of missing women along the U.S./Mexico border recently highlighted by spokespeople around the year 2000 (Reineke 2022; Morales and Bejarano 2009). Thus, indigenous movements in the twenty-first century are transcending tribal and state boundaries.

For many Indigenous individuals, there may be a quiet voice commanding them to speak up on behalf of their people. Many of these individuals are no longer remaining silent and finding one another in pursuit of Indigenous human rights; thereby, challenging the very legitimacy of settler colony regimes for the sake of criminal justice.

MICHAEL LERMA

References

- Anaya, S. James. 2009. *International Human Rights and Indigenous Peoples*, 1st edn. Austin: Wolters Kluwer Law & Business.
- Coulthard, Glen Sean. 2014. *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition, Indigenous Americas*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Crawford, Neta. 2007. "The Long Peace among Iroquois Nations." In *War and Peace in the Ancient World*, edited by Kurt A. Raaflaub 348–68. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, Ltd.
- Getches, David H. 2011. *Cases and Materials on Federal Indian Law*, 6th edn. St. Paul: Thomson/West.
- Goertz, Gary. 2003. *International Norms and Decision-Making: A Punctuated Equilibrium Model*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Holm, T., J. D. Pearson, and B. Chavis. 2003. "Peoplehood: A Model for the Extension of Sovereignty in American Indian Studies." *Wicazo Sa Review* 18, no. 1: 7–24.
- Lerma, Michael. 2014. *Indigenous Sovereignty in the 21st Century: Knowledge for the Indigenous Spring*. Gainesville, FL: Florida Academic Press, Inc.
- Lerma, Michael. 2021. "Well-Known Secret Graveyards: (Re)discovering the Horrors of Assimilation for Indigenous Peoples." Available at <https://blog.oup.com/2021/09/well-known-secret-graveyards-rediscovering-the-horrors-of-assimilation-for-indigenous-peoples/>. Accessed August 9, 2022.
- Lomawaima, K. Tsianina, and T. L. McCarty. 2006. *"To Remain an Indian": Lessons in Democracy from a Century of Native American Education*. New York: Teachers Press.
- Mahoney, James. 2010. *Colonialism and Postcolonial Development: Spanish America in Comparative Perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Morales, Maria Cristina and Cynthia Bejarano. 2009. "Transnational Sexual and Gendered Violence: An Application of Border Sexual Conquest at a Mexico-US border." *Networks* 9, no. 3: 420–39.
- Reineke, Robin C. 2022. "Forensic Citizenship among Families of Missing Migrants Along the U.S.-Mexico Border." *Citizenship Studies* 26, no. 1: 21–37.

106. Inequality

This entry briefly examines political, economic, and social inequality with a focus on the Western world. Over the last 300 years, equality emerged as one of the highest social ideals, rivalled perhaps only by that of “freedom.” The quest for equality has provoked protests, rebellions, even revolutions, and now undergirds, in complicated ways, much of the formal legal edifice of liberal democratic societies. Today, progressives see inequality as a major – if not *the* major – source of ongoing injustice in contemporary societies.

Conceptually, inequality is often understood as having a *distributive* component, referring to the distribution of resources between people (Cohen 1989; Dworkin 1981), as well as a *relational* component, referring to whether relationships between people are characterized by domination or disrespect (Anderson 1999; Scheffler 2003; Tawney 1931). Sociologists typically focus on three major dimensions of inequality: disparities in power, resources, and status, although in practice these types of inequality are often highly interrelated.

Political inequality

Political inequality refers to disparities in political power between members of a community. There is wide agreement among historians and anthropologists that for roughly 95 percent of the existence of our species *Homo sapiens sapiens*, human beings lived as hunter-gatherers, who were largely (though not always) “fiercely egalitarian” (Lee 1988). Decisions were often made collectively and key resources (especially hunted meat) were usually shared in a highly egalitarian manner. Hence, such societies are frequently described as “anarchistic” and “communitistic” (Boehm 1999; Lee and Daly 2010; Wiessner 1996; though compare with Graeber and Wengrow 2021).

Significant political inequality emerged during the neolithic revolution (from 10,000 BCE), when the transition to agriculture provided the economic basis for denser settlements and the possibility of storing surplus food (Scott 2017). It is here that we see the emergence of privileged military leaders, priests, and kings on the one side, supported

by the forced labor of serfs or slaves on the other.

Colonialism has been a major source of political inequality between communities. In 1492, Christopher Columbus reached the land of the Taino people (present day Haiti). After 200 years of colonial pillage – legally sanctioned by the church (e.g., Pope Alexander VI 1493) – Indigenous populations were reduced by about 90 percent through disease, impoverishment, slavery, and genocide (Dunbar-Ortiz 2014; Galeano 1973). In Canada and the United States, the Indigenous nations were forced off their traditional lands and herded into small, unproductive reserves under the political authority of the occupying settler states (Manuel and Derrickson 2015; Zinn 1996). At the height of its empire in 1922, Britain controlled the lives of 458 million people and one-quarter of the Earth’s landmass.

Within European societies, the 1600s and 1700s saw the spread of new liberal and capitalistic ideas alongside the rising merchant or “bourgeois” class, which challenged the divine right of kings, and insisted that all men were equal, with “natural rights” to life, liberty, and property (Hobbes [1651] 2002; Locke [1689] 1980; Macpherson 1962; Rousseau [1762] 1987). The first major challenge to the political supremacy of the nobility was the English Revolution (1639–51). Even more profoundly, the French Revolution (1789–99) overthrew the feudal order, executed King Louis XVI, abolished the privileges of the Church, and in its place established a radically new system of representative democracy based on universal male (but not female) suffrage (National Assembly of France 1789; Hobsbawm 1964).

As formal political equality slowly spread throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, so too did economic inequality, spurred on by the Industrial Revolution and the emergence of new gigantic corporations. Today, the political systems of the Western world are formally democratic, but in practice these societies retain a number of oligarchic features (see, Gilens and Page 2014 for a discussion of the American case). Lobbying by the rich and the corporate sector is extensive (OpenSecrets 2022); elected representatives are typically far richer than the electorate (Carnes 2012; Lupu and Warner 2022); and mainstream media is owned by a small

handful of rich individuals and corporations (Cagé 2016; Herman and Chomsky 1988).

Today, egalitarians advocate for political reforms along a number of lines:

- *Improving political democracy* by curtailing the influence of money in politics, expanding the use of citizens assemblies (Gastil and Wright 2019), and creating new avenues for direct participation (Barber 1984; Fung and Wright 2003).
- *Expanding democracy in the economy* by democratizing workplaces, banks, and investment flows (Malleon 2014; Schweickart 2011).
- *Creating a global architecture of democracy* (Cabrera 2004; Held 1995).
- *Improving the democratic rights of migrants, refugees, and non-status residents* (Carens 2013).
- *Fighting for Indigenous rights and sovereignty* (Manuel and Derrickson 2015; Pasternak and King 2019).

In the opposite direction, recent years have seen the rise of new populist movements characterized by authoritarianism and anti-democratic tendencies (Inglehart and Norris 2016).

Economic inequality

Economic inequality refers to disparities in income and wealth. Generally speaking, economic inequality worsened during the 1800s as industrialized capitalism took off, then fell sharply from 1914 to the 1970s due to the World Wars, the Great Depression, the rise of strong labor unions, high progressive taxes, and social democratic regulations of the market, and then reversed again from the 1980s following the rightward shift of most countries to neoliberalism.

In 1970, the average income of the poorest 50 percent of the American population (after adjusting for inflation) was \$15,200 per year per adult, while that of the richest 1 percent was \$403,000 – a ratio of 1:26. By 2015 it was \$16,200: \$1,305,000, a ratio of 1:81. Today, the top 1 percent control roughly 20 percent of the country's income and 40 percent of national wealth (Piketty 2014, 2020). Globally the picture is even starker. The richest eight men control the same amount of wealth as half the entire planet (Oxfam 2017).

Whether such levels of economic inequality are justified or not remains a highly contentious question. In general, social democrats and especially socialists argue that the rich do not deserve their wealth because it derives from a combination of luck, privilege, exploitation, and, ultimately, the collective labor of other members of the community; thus, wealth should be redistributed in a highly egalitarian manner, with more attention paid to “need” than “deservingness” (e.g., Rawls 2001; Schweickart 2011; Wright 2010). Neoliberals disagree and argue that free markets distribute income fairly, according to the value of each individual's contribution to the economy (e.g., Friedman [1962] 2002; Mankiw 2013). On this view, not only is inequality deserved, it is practically useful, since the lure of great wealth and the fear of great poverty act as a powerful motivation to take risks, innovate, and invest. The main libertarian contention is that inequality emerges naturally from voluntary gifts and market exchanges. The state has no right to engage in redistribution as that would mean infringing on people's “natural rights” to their private property. From this perspective, inequality is natural and taxation is a kind of theft (e.g., Narveson 2001; Nozick 1974).

Social inequality

Social inequality refers to disparities in rights, respect, status, and recognition between people. These disparities can be based on gender, race, ethnicity, sexuality, and religion among other markers of difference. Understanding how the different dimensions of a person's identity (such as being a gay male Muslim) combine to create different modes of oppression and privilege is often referred to as “intersectionality” (Combahee Collective 1977; Crenshaw 1989).

In terms of gender inequality, the first wave of the feminist movement centered on the struggle for basic citizenship rights (such as the right to vote and own property). The second wave began in the 1960s and demanded equality of opportunity for women, including jobs at equal pay and bodily autonomy (e.g., abortion rights). The third wave of feminism from the 1990s onward sought to highlight the very real inequalities between the white middle-class women who led the feminist movement and other women, particularly women of color, queer women, and

transgender people. Though there is still a significant gender gap today (largely attributable to the ongoing gendered division of labor (Nedelsky and Malleson 2023)), it is remarkable that in the past century feminists have overthrown many of the hierarchies that dominated women's lives for thousands of years, making it arguably the most successful egalitarian movement in human history.

Racism is the belief that human beings can be categorized into a hierarchy of distinguishable "races." It is a relatively recent idea that emerged in the 1700s, predominantly as a way to justify the burgeoning economic practice of stealing African people to be sold as slaves in the Caribbean and United States. As Ta-Nehisi Coates (2015) remarks: "race is the child of racism, not the father."

Today, "race" has been debunked as having no genuine biological basis. Nevertheless, the legacy of racism and white supremacy continues profoundly impacting Black and Indigenous peoples as well as Latinx, Asian, Roma, Jewish, Muslim, and other racialized groups. Racism remains fundamental to the operation of American society as evidenced by the enormous disparities among races that exist in wealth, education, incarceration, police violence, and practically every other social, economic, and health indicator (Alexander 2010; Darity and Mullen 2020; Vitale 2018).

Since the 1980s, a variety of other social egalitarian movements have emerged, with the most important being the disability rights movement (Stiker 1999), the environmental justice movement (Klein 2014), and the animal liberation movement (Singer 1990).

TOM MALLESON

References

- Alexander, M. 2010. *The New Jim Crow*. New York: The New Press.
- Anderson, E. 1999. "What Is the Point of Equality?" *Ethics*, 109 no. 2: 287–337.
- Barber, B. 1984. *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Boehm, C. 1999. *Hierarchy in the Forest: The Evolution of Egalitarian Behaviour*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cabrera, L. 2004. *Political Theory of Global Justice: A Cosmopolitan Case for the World State*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Cagé, J. 2016. *Saving the Media: Capitalism, Crowdfunding, and Democracy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Carens, J. H. 2013. *The Ethics of Immigration*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Carnes, N. 2012. "Does the Numerical Underrepresentation of the Working Class in Congress Matter? *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 37, no. 1: 5–34.
- Coates, T.-N. 2015. *Between the World and Me*. New York: Spiegel & Grau.
- Cohen, G. A. 1989. "On the Currency of Egalitarian Justice." *Ethics* 99, no. 4: 906–44.
- Combahee Collective. 1977. "The Combahee River Collective Statement." Retrieved from <https://web.archive.org/web/20170224021117/http://circuitous.org/scraps/combahee.html>.
- Crenshaw, K. 1989. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics." *The University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 139–68.
- Darity, W., and K. Mullen. 2020. "Black Reparations and the Racial Wealth Gap." Retrieved from www.brookings.edu/blog/up-front/2020/06/15/black-reparations-and-the-racial-wealth-gap/.
- Dunbar-Ortiz, R. 2014. *An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Dworkin, R. 1981. "What is Equality? Part 2: Equality of Resources." *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 10, no. 4: 283–345.
- Friedman, M. ([1962] 2002). *Capitalism and Freedom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fung, A., and E.O. Wright, eds. 2003. *Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance*. London: Verso.
- Galeano, E. 1973. *Open Veins of Latin America: Five Centuries of the Pillage of a Continent*, translated by C. Belfrage. London: Monthly Review Press.
- Gastil, J. and E.O. Wright, eds. 2019. *Legislature by Lot: Transformative Designs for Deliberative Governance*. London: Verso Books.
- Gilens, M. and B.I. Page. 2014. "Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens." *Perspectives on Politics*, 12, no. 3: 564–81.
- Graeber, D. and D. Wengrow. 2021. *The Dawn of Everything: A New History of Humanity*. London: Penguin UK.
- Held, D. 1995. *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Herman, E. S. and N. Chomsky. 1988. *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*. New York: Pantheon Books.

- Hobbes, T. 2002 [1651]. *Leviathan*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.
- Hobsbawm, E. 1964. *The Age of Revolution: Europe 1789–1848*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Inglehart, R. and P. Norris. 2016. *Trump, Brexit, and the Rise of Populism: Economic Have-nots and Cultural Backlash*. Retrieved from Trump, Brexit, and the Rise of Populism: Economic Have-Nots and Cultural Backlash by Ronald F. Inglehart, Pippa Norris :: SSRN.
- Klein, N. 2014. *This Changes Everything: Capitalism vs. The Climate*. Toronto: Alfred A. Knopf Canada.
- Lee, R. B. 1988. “Reflections on Primitive Communism.” In *Hunters and Gatherers. Volume 1: History, Evolution and Social Change*, edited by T. Ingold, D. Riches, and J. Woodburn, 252–68. Oxford: Berg.
- Lee, R. B. and R. Daly, eds. 2010. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Hunters and Gatherers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Locke, J. (1980 [1689]). *Second Treatise of Government*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing.
- Lupu, N. and Z. Warner. 2022. “Affluence and Congruence: Unequal Representation Around the World.” *Journal of Politics* 84, no. 1: 276–90.
- Macpherson, C. B. 1962. *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism: Hobbes to Locke*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Malleson, T. 2014. *After Occupy: Economic Democracy for the 21st Century*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mankiw, N. G. 2013. “Defending the One Percent.” *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 27, no. 3: 21–34.
- Manuel, A. and R.M. Derrickson. 2015. *Unsettling Canada: A National Wake-up Call*. Toronto: Between the Lines.
- National Assembly of France. 1789. “Declaration of the Rights of Man.” Retrieved from https://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/rightsof.asp.
- Narveson, J. 2001. *The Libertarian Idea*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.
- Nedelsky, J., and T. Malleson. 2023. *Part-Time for All: A Care Manifesto*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nozick, R. 1974. *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*. New York: Basic Books.
- OpenSecrets. 2022. “Who are the Biggest Organization Donors?” Retrieved from www.opensecrets.org/elections-overview/top-organizations.
- Oxfam. 2017. *An Economy for the 99%*. Retrieved from Oxford: <https://oxfamlibrary.openrepository.com/bitstream/handle/10546/620170/bp-economy-for-99-percent-160117-en.pdf;jsessionid=33258DA0F99CF9EE3DAE8B4BBAF14EE1?sequence=1>
- Pasternak, S., and H. King. 2019. *Land Back*. Retrieved red-paper-report-final.pdf (yellow-headinstitute.org).
- Piketty, T. 2014. *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Piketty, T. 2020. *Capital and Ideology*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Pope Alexander VI. 1493. “The Bull Inter Caetera.” Retrieved from www.nativeweb.org/pages/legal/indig-inter-caetera.html.
- Rawls, J. 2001. *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rousseau, J.-J. (1987 [1762]). “On the Social Contract.” In *The Basic Political Writings of Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, edited by P. Gay, 141–227. Indianapolis: Hackett.
- Scheffler, S. 2003. “What is Egalitarianism?” *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 31, no. 1: 5–39.
- Schweickart, D. 2011. *After Capitalism*, 2nd edition. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Scott, J. C. 2017. *Against the Grain*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Singer, P. 1990. *Animal Liberation*, 2nd edition. New York: New York Review of Books.
- Stiker, H.-J. 1999. *A History of Disability*, translated by W. Sayers. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Tawney, R. H. 1931. *Equality*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- Vitale, A. 2018. *The End of Policing*. Verso: London.
- Wiessner, P. 1996. “Leveling the Hunter.” In *Food and the Status Quest*, edited by P. Viessner and W. Schiefenhovel, 171–91. Providence: Berghahn Books.
- Wright, E. O. 2010. *Envisioning Real Utopias*. London: Verso.
- Zinn, H. 1996. *A People's History of the United States*, 2nd edition. New York: Longman.

107. Internal colonialism

Internal colonialism is a concept originally developed by dependency theorists writing about Latin America to explain the racial impacts of poverty and isolation on native indigenous tribes in relation to the white Creole and *mestizo* populations that governed these countries. André Gunder Frank was primarily responsible for spreading dependency theory throughout Latin America as he considered Latin American inequities to be fundamental impediments to the development of industrial capitalism in the region. Historically, he argued, Latin American economies had been effectively robbed of labor and natural resources to fuel capitalist development in Europe and the United States (Frank 1972, 19). Furthermore, dependency theorists popularized the term “internal colonialism” in their work to highlight the fact that Latin American economies had both modern and backward components. Internal colonies were controlled racially, economically, and socially from the outside, but existed within an established nation-state. For Pablo González Casanova (2007), internal colonialism is initially associated with physical conquest, where local inhabitants are not slaughtered, but form part of the conquering state even after that state gains formal independence. People, minorities, and nations internally colonized by nation-states experience similar conditions to colonialism. For example, Rodolfo Stavenhagen (1970, 271) describes the relationship between Ladinos and the Maya Indians of Chiapas and northern Guatemala as internal colonialism insofar as the Indians lost their lands and were coercively forced to work for their internal colonizers.

In the 1960s, Black nationalists and Chicano revolutionaries in the United States adopted the concept to explain their similarly disadvantaged condition as it seemed to provide an explanation for the spatial segregation, lawful discrimination (Jim Crow/Juan Crow), external administration, poverty, and police brutality experienced by African-Americans and Mexican-Americans. Many African-American and Mexican-American intellectuals and political activists learned about the theory of internal colonialism by reading the works of Ernesto “Che” Guevara, as well as being the benefi-

ciaries of a wide diffusion of Latin American dependency theory in the United States at the time (Casanova 1965). Thus, as Ramon A. Gutierrez (2004, 281) observes, Black Nationalists and Chicano radicals:

embraced, transformed, and further elaborated on the idea of internal colonialism to explain their own subordinate status in the United States, which was the product of forced enslavement and military occupation. As a colonized population in the United States, Blacks and Chicanos suffered the effects of racism, were dominated by outsiders, much as colonial subjects in the Third World had seen their indigenous values and ways of life destroyed.

The theory of internal colonization was first proposed by Harold Cruse, an African-American intellectual who published an article in *Studies on the Left* on “Revolutionary Nationalism and the Afro-American” (1962). In this article, Cruse argued that “the Negro is the American problem of underdevelopment” and this problem was the direct result of political, economic, and cultural relations of domestic colonialism inside the United States. The effect of domestic colonialism was that Afro-Americans lived in conditions similar to those of the poor populations of Latin America and Africa, which were plagued by “hunger, illiteracy, disease, ties to the land, urban and semi-urban slums, cultural starvation, and the psychological reactions to being over by others not of his kind” (Cruse 1967, 74, 76).

Stokely Carmichael and Charles V. Hamilton further advanced this idea in their book, *Black Power* (1967). Carmichael and Hamilton (1967) documented numerous examples of domestic colonial relations, such as denying home mortgages to ghetto residents, which forced them to remain in relations of dependency to white slum lords, while paying higher prices for food and consumer goods than Whites would pay in their own neighborhoods at the same White-owned stores. Carmichael and Hamilton (1967, 17) claimed that in numerous ways White “exploiters come into the ghetto from outside, bleed it dry, and leave it economically dependent on the larger society.” Carmichael and Hamilton (1967, 4-5) also drew an explicit distinction between individual racial attitudes and “institutional racism.”

They claimed that institutional racism was embedded in the economic, political, and cultural relations of domestic colonialism. These institutions could not be educated away one person at a time, but required a fundamental realignment of power relations in American society. Thus, Carmichael and Hamilton called for a global Black Power movement that would link the struggles of African-Americans in the United States to the struggles of similarly colonized populations in Africa, Latin America, and Asia. The term worked its way into mainstream political discourse as evidenced by the fact that the liberal Democratic U.S. Presidential candidate Eugene McCarthy referred to African Americans as a colonized people (Blauner 2001, 65).

Similarly, for Mexican Americans, the manifesto called *El Plan Espiritual de Aztlán*, written by Luis Valdez, Juan Gómez-Quinones, Alurista, and Jorge González proposed that a nationalist, anti-colonial rebellion would free Mexican-Americans or Chicanos (Gutiérrez 2004). The sociologist Joan Moore (1970) maintained that the Southwest Mexican-origin population is complexly stratified, even economically, so if theorists of internal colonialism wanted to incite Chicanos to militant action, it would require a unifying ideology such as the theory of internal colonialism. Robert Blauner advanced the concept of internal colonialism as a way of understanding the “Chicano” movement in the United States by claiming that white skin racial privilege was at the center of the colonial relationship, which was institutionalized as an “unfair advantage, favorable circumstance, or institutional ‘head start’ in the pursuit of social ideals” (Blauner 1972, 22). He argued that whites in the United States have traditionally advanced at the cost of Blacks, Chicanos, and other Third World peoples.

PEDRO GONSALVES DE ALCÂNTARA FORMIGA

References

- Blauner, Robert. 1972. *Racial Oppression in America*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Blauner, Robert. 2001. *Still Big News: Racial Oppression in America*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Carmichael, Stokely and Charles V. Hamilton. 1967. *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Casanova, Pablo Gonzalez. 1965. “Internal Colonialism and National Development.” *Studies in Comparative International Development* 1, no. 4: 27–37.
- Cruse, Harold W. 1962. “Revolutionary Nationalism and the Afro-American.” *Studies on the Left* Nos. 2/3 (1962): 12–25.
- Cruse, Harold. 1968. *Revolutionary Nationalism and the Afro-American*. New York: William Morrow & Co.
- Frank, André Gunder. 1969. *Latin America: Underdevelopment or Revolution*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- González Casanova, Pablo. 2007. *Colonialismo interno (uma redefinição)*. Buenos Aires: CLACSO.
- Gutiérrez, Ramón A. 2004. “Internal Colonialism: An American Theory of Race.” *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race* 1, no. 2: 281–95.
- Moore, Joan W. 1970. “Colonialism: The Case of the Mexican Americans.” *Social Problems* 17, no. 4 (1970): 463–72. <https://doi.org/10.2307/799679>.
- Stavenhagen, Rodolfo. 1970. “Class, Colonialism, and Acculturation.” In *Masses in Latin America*, edited by Irving L. Horowitz, 235–88. New York: Oxford University Press.

Further readings

- Almaguer, Tomás. 1994. *Racial Fault Lines: The Historical Origins of White Supremacy in California*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gutiérrez, José Angel. 1998. *The Making of a Chicano Militant: Lessons from Cristal*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- King, Martin Luther, Jr. 1968. *Where Do We Go From Here: Chaos or Community?* Boston: Beacon Press.

See also

Neo-Colonialism; Nation and Nationalism; Dependency Theory; Latino Politics and Marxism

108. Investment theory of party competition

The investment theory of party competition (ITPC) was developed by the American political scientist Thomas Ferguson in the early 1980s. Ferguson's work challenges several mainstream political science theories, such as the claim that party competition is driven by the search for the "median voter," as well as variants of realignment theory. While competition for votes is important, it is secondary to the real market for political parties – investors. Business interests and wealthy individuals seek to control the state for their own ends. As Ferguson (1995, 22) puts it: "Blocs of major investors define the core of political parties and are responsible for most of the signals the party sends to the electorate." These investor blocs seek to advance candidates who represent their interests. Or, put more pithily, Ferguson (1995, 8) recommends the "Golden Rule" of political analysis – to discover who rules, follow the gold.

In their co-edited book on the 1980 election, Ferguson and Joel Rogers identified two sides of presidential campaigns. One is public and visible, involving conventions, speeches and voting results. The other side is often hidden and connects to Ferguson's investment theory, which depicts a "complex process by which pivotal interest groups like oil companies, international banks, weapons producers, labor unions, and even foreign countries coalesce behind particular candidates to advance their own ends" (Ferguson and Rogers 1981, 6). The ITPC informed the analysis of contemporary American politics by Ferguson and Rogers in their 1986 book *Right Turn: The Decline of the Democrats and the Future of American Politics* (Ferguson and Rogers 1986). Ferguson's theoretical and historical articles were collected in his 1995 book *Golden Rule: The Investment Theory of Party Competition and the Logic of Money-Driven Political Systems* (Ferguson 1995). He has continued to apply the theory to American politics, including presidential elections, in a series of articles, usually co-authored and often published by the Institute for New Economic Thinking, where he serves as research director (e.g. Ferguson, Jorgensen, and Chen 2018).

The investment theory contributes to critical theories of the state and to understanding the role of business interests in securing corporate dominance in a capitalist democracy. It radically revises standard views of the core dynamics of election campaigns. During campaigns, investors exercise influence not simply through cash contributions, but through such "organizational" interventions as acting as sources of contacts, as fundraisers, and as sources of legitimation (Ferguson 1995, 41). In principle, ordinary citizens could act as investors as well, through labor unions or other forms of mass mobilization. But given the relative weakness of mass-based secondary organizations in the United States, the information and coordination costs confronting voters are prohibitively high, which means that "the costs that the voters must bear to control policy will be literally beyond their means" (Ferguson 1995, 29). As a consequence, when the number of significant campaign investors is small, the possibility for mass voting to control public policy, a cornerstone of democratic theory, is greatly diminished in practice. Indeed, the investment theory expects "many efforts to adjust the public to the parties' views rather than vice versa." Under these conditions, "Elections become contests between several oligarchic parties whose major public policy proposals reflect the interests of large investors" (Ferguson 1995, 36, 28).

Ferguson's major historical application of the ITPC, and perhaps his most-frequently cited work, is his 1984 article "From 'Normalcy' to New Deal: Industrial Structure, Party Competition, and American Public Policy in the Great Depression" (see Ferguson 1995, Chapter Two). He argues that the New Deal of the 1930s rested on a new type of political coalition that emerged in support of President Franklin Roosevelt's policies. This coalition was not made up of the workers, blacks, and poor that preoccupy liberal observers. Rather, at the center, was "a new 'historical bloc' (in Gramsci's phrase) of capital-intensive industries, investment banks, and internationally oriented commercial banks" (Ferguson 1995, 117). This investor realignment represented a breakdown of the Republican dominant system of 1896, whose hegemonic bloc was "intensely nationalist, protectionist, and (with a few notable exceptions) generally labor-intensive," and included much of finance (Ferguson 1995,

131). This coalition first began to splinter after World War I as capital-intensive firms such as Standard Oil and General Electric began to emerge for whom labor issues were less demanding and who favored lower tariffs to stimulate world trade and open new markets. International banks also moved away from protectionist policies in the interwar period. These firms formed the business coalition backing FDR's New Deal policies. By the time of the 1936 elections, FDR was receiving support from executives at Chase Manhattan, Goldman Sachs, Standard Oil, General Electric, International Harvester, Zenith, IBM, ITT, Sears, United Fruit and Pan Am, among others (Ferguson 1995, 156–7). But the achievements of the New Deal cannot be explained entirely without reference to the independent industrial unionism that marked the Depression decade. As Ferguson puts it, “for the first time in American history, masses of ordinary voters organized themselves and succeeded in pooling resources to become major independent investors in a party system” (Ferguson 1995, 82).

Ferguson's theory has been cited frequently and variations of the ITPC approach have been used by several scholars (Temin 2017, Chapter 6). Full-scale engagements and critiques have been rare. Sociologist Michael Webber criticized the theory and its application to the New Deal in a 1991 article to which Ferguson responded. Webber and his mentor, G. William Domhoff, criticized the theory's application to the election of 1936 in an *American Political Science Review* article (Webber 1991; Ferguson 1995, Chapter 4; Webber and Domhoff 1996).

JOSEPH G. PESCHEK

References

- Ferguson, Thomas. 1995. *Golden Rule: The Investment Theory of Party Competition and the Logic of Money-Driven Political Systems*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ferguson, Thomas, Paul Jorgensen, and Jie Chen. 2018. “Industrial Structure and Political Outcomes: The Case of the 2016 US Presidential Election.” In *The Palgrave Handbook of Political Economy*, edited by Ivano Cardinale and Roberto Scazzieri, 333–440. Cheltenham, UK: Palgrave.
- Ferguson, Thomas, and Joel Rogers. 1981. “The Reagan Victory: Corporate Coalitions in the 1980 Campaign.” In *The Hidden Election: Politics and Economics in the 1980 Presidential Campaign*, edited by Thomas Ferguson and Joel Rogers, 3–64. New York: Pantheon.
- Ferguson, Thomas, and Joel Rogers. 1986. *Right Turn: The Decline of the Democrats and the Future of American Politics*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Temin, Peter. 2017. *The Vanishing Middle Class: Prejudice and Power in a Dual Economy*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.
- Webber, Michael. 1991. “Business, the Democratic Party, and the New Deal: An Empirical Critique of Thomas Ferguson's ‘Investment Theory of Politics’.” *Sociological Perspectives*, Vol 34, no. 4: 473–92.
- Webber, Michael, and G. William Domhoff. 1996. “Myth and Reality in Business Support for Democrats and Republicans in the 1936 Presidential Election.” *American Political Science Review* 90, no. 4: 824–33.

See also

Capitalist Class; Corporate Power; Hegemony; Power; Power Structure Analysis; Ruling Class

109. Lumpenproletariat

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels invented the term “lumpenproletariat,” when they first used it in *The German Ideology* (2010 [1846], 202) to distinguish the rising industrial proletariat from a different category they described in *The Communist Manifesto* (1848) as “the ‘dangerous class’, the social scum, that passively rotting mass thrown off by the lowest layers of old society” (Marx and Engels, 1976, Vol. 6, 494). Marx and Engels juxtapose the proletariat to the lumpenproletariat to argue that “the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class.” In making this distinction, Marx and Engels were initially engaged in a polemic with the anarchist Max Stirner (1913, 147–9), and later with the anarchist Michael Bakunin (Dolgoft 1972), who viewed the lumpenproletariat as a revolutionary class, because of its impoverished existence on the margins of capitalist society. In contrast, Marx and Engels (1976, Vol. 6, 494) argued that because of its impoverished existence, the lumpenproletariat’s “conditions of life ... prepare it far more for the part of a bribed tool of reactionary intrigue” than a revolutionary transformation of capitalist society.

In later writings, the concept of the lumpenproletariat rarely appears in Marx’s and Engel’s theoretical writings, but it does make an appearance in many of their political writings, particularly *The Class Struggles in France* (2010 [1848–50]) and *The 18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (1979 [1851–52]). In these historical accounts of the French Revolution of 1848, and Louis Bonaparte’s subsequent rise to become Emperor of the Second French Empire (1852–70), Marx argues that the course of historical events bore out his earlier claim that the lumpenproletariat would serve as “a bribed tool of reactionary intrigue.” Marx points out that the lumpenproletariat betrayed the proletariat at a critical revolutionary moment when the lumpenproletariat was organized into the Mobile Guard to serve as an armed base of mass support for Louise Bonaparte’s dictatorship. For this reason, Marx (1979, 149–50; 1983, 388) describes Louis Bonaparte as “chief of the Paris lumpenproletariat” and “the Lumpenproletariat emperor.”

This view of the lumpenproletariat was largely accepted by Marxist theorists of the

2nd and 3rd Internationals, including Karl Kautsky, Rosa Luxemburg, V.I. Lenin, and Mao Tse-Tung. However, in the twentieth century, these revolutionary political theorists confronted the problem that the lumpenproletariat had not disappeared, as originally predicted by Marx, but continued to play a political role in both parliamentary and revolutionary politics as it had done in France from 1848 to 1871. Kautsky (1946, 126; 1971, 168–9) offered the harshest assessment and concluded that the lumpenproletariat will simply have to be dealt with by force. Luxemburg (1961, 73–4) saw this option as counter-productive and instead proposed to make the lumpenproletariat a bribed tool of socialist intrigue by rapidly expanding the welfare state. Lenin (1963, 384) and Mao (1964, 19) entertained the idea that lumpenproletarians could be recruited into revolutionary armies and controlled with military discipline, but they both cautioned that the lumpenproletariat was always a source of disruption, which could never be trusted because of their anarchistic and criminal inclinations.

With the exception of these sporadic discussions, the lumpenproletariat was generally ignored by Marxist political theorists until the 1960s and 1970s when it was adopted by many in the New Left as a useful concept for understanding Third World anti-colonial movements, the U.S. Black Power movement, and the global youth and student movements (Worsley 1972). These upheavals were not led by Marx’s industrial proletariat, but by the rural and urban masses living outside core capitalist relations of production, and who were excluded from participating in those relations by the very processes of modernization and capitalist development.

The lumpen debate of the 1960s and 1970s was sparked by Frantz Fanon (1968), who observed that as independent peasants were displaced by colonizer controlled industrial agriculture, they either became disenfranchised and migratory landless agricultural laborers or they flocked into burgeoning Third World cities where they fueled the growth of a mass urban lumpenproletariat. Fanon argued that this new lumpenproletariat was acting as the spearhead of anti-colonial and anti-capitalist revolutions in those countries. Fanon’s view of the lumpenproletariat was adapted to the United States by several founders of the Black Panther Party (BPP), including Huey P. Newton, Bobby Seale, Eldridge

Cleaver, and Stokely Carmichael. However, in the United States, Cleaver (1972) and others in the BPP went beyond Fanon's view of the lumpenproletariat as an urban *spearhead* of anti-capitalist revolution to claim that the lumpenproletariat was now *the vanguard of the proletariat*. Cleaver makes this leap based on a pioneering assessment of capitalist development in its post-industrial phase, which he argues is rapidly displacing the white (and colored) working class through automation.

Consequently, Cleaver argued that the white working class would soon join the ranks of the black lumpenproletariat and this logic of capitalist development meant that the long-term interests of the white proletariat were allied to those of the black lumpenproletariat. The white working class was about to become a non-working class as a result of globalization and automation and, therefore, Cleaver predicted they would soon join the ranks of a multi-racial and multi-ethnic lumpenproletariat. However, Cleaver was simultaneously concerned that a burgeoning white lumpenproletariat might become a new line of mass resistance to progressive social transformation. Along these lines, the concept has regained some currency in explanations of the rise of white ethno-nationalist and authoritarian political movements in contemporary capitalist democracies (Barrow 2020).

CLYDE W. BARROW

References

- Barrow, Clyde W. 2020. *The Dangerous Class: The Concept of the Lumpenproletariat*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Cleaver, Eldridge. 1972. "On Lumpen Ideology." *The Black Scholar* 4, no. 3 (November-December): 2–10.
- Dolgoft, Sam, ed. 1972. *Bakunin on Anarchy*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Fanon, Frantz. 1968. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press.
- Kautsky, Karl. 1946. *Social Democracy versus Communism*. New York: Rand School.
- Kautsky, Karl. 1971. *The Class Struggle*. New York: W.W. Norton and Co, Inc.
- Luxemburg, Rosa. 1961. *The Russian Revolution and Leninism or Marxism?* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1961.
- Lenin, V.I. 1963. "A Caricature of Bolshevism." In *V.I. Lenin's Collected Works*, Vol. 15, 383–94. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Mao Tse-tung. 1964. "Analysis of the Classes in Chinese Society." In *Selected Works*, Vol. 1. Peking: Foreign Language Press.
- Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. 1976. [1848]. "The Communist Manifesto." In *Marx-Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 6, 477–519. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Marx, Karl. 1979 [1851–52]. "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte." In *Marx-Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 11, 99–197. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Marx, Karl. 1983 [1853]. "189 Marx to Engels in Manchester [London] 12 October 1853." In *Marx-Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 39, 387–8. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Marx, Karl. 2010 [1846]. "The German Ideology." In *Marx-Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 5, 19–539. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Marx, Karl. 2010 [1851–52]. "The Class Struggles in France, 1848–1850." In *Marx-Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 10, 45–145. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Stirner, Max. 1913. *The Ego and His Own*, translated from the German by Steven T. Byinton. New York: E.C. Walker, 1913.
- Worsley, Peter. 1972. "Frantz Fanon and the 'Lumpenproletariat'." In *Socialist Register 1972*, edited by Ralph Miliband and John Savile, 193–230. London: Merlin Press.

Further readings

- Draper, Hal. 1972. "The Concept of the 'Lumpenproletariat' in Marx and Engels." *Economies Et Societies* 15 (December): 285–312.
- Draper, Hal. 1978. *Karl Marx's Theory of Revolution*, Vol. 2. *The Politics of Social Classes*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

110. Marriage equality

Marriage equality refers to the full inclusion of same-sex couples in the historically heterosexual-only relationship of marriage, which has personal, communal, religious, and legal components. The political movement for marriage equality (also called gay marriage or same-sex marriage) focused predominantly on civil marriage, which entails governmental recognition of two people as legally joined and thus eligible for special benefits not available to other types of dyads.

The topic of marriage equality came to the fore of public discourse, after the Hawaii Supreme Court ruled in 1993 that the denial of marriage equality constitutes sex discrimination but failed to remedy the situation. Massachusetts became the first state to legalize same-sex marriage in 2004, beginning a movement that ultimately resulted in 36 states establishing marriage equality. Because of the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA), passed by Congress in 1996, however, couples could receive only state-level benefits and not federal ones. That changed on June 26, 2015, when the Supreme Court finally overturned DOMA with its landmark *Obergefell v Hodges* decision, ruling that same-sex couples have a fundamental right to marry because of the due process and the equal protection clauses in the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

While political and religious conservatives argued against marriage equality, much of the significant literature on the topic came from law professors and literary critics, such as Eskridge (1996) and Warner (1991), as well as journalists and activists (Vaid 1996), rather than political scientists. Some proponents argued for equality on the basis of constitutional law (Eskridge 1996), and some made conservative arguments supporting marriage equality (Sullivan 1995). More radical voices criticized the pro-marriage cadre in the LGBT community for favoring assimilation and normalization (Warner 1999).

In the field of political science in particular, academic arguments about marriage equality can be divided into three camps. First, some political science scholars wrote arguments in favor of allowing same-sex couples to legally marry, using liberal, constitutional principles to make the case (Gerstmann 2003; Snyder 2006). Others argued for marriage equality

from a communitarian perspective. Those latter arguments included the contention that democratic communities should be able to choose marriage equality for themselves, instead of having it prohibited by law (Sandel 1996; Lehr 1999); that same-sex relationships should be defended on moral grounds, rather than simply allowed because of liberal tolerance (Sandel 1996); and that same-sex marriage could offer a more egalitarian vision of relationship than traditional heterosexual marriage, which was forged in patriarchy and capitalism (West 1998).

A second group of political scientists argued against marriage equality from a conservative communitarian perspective. The major approach in this line of thinking asserts that the traditional, heterosexual-only family provides the foundation for civil society (Elshtain 1991). That is to say, the heterosexual family functions as a “seedbed of virtue,” instilling in children the character and values necessary for democratic citizenship (Galston 1995). This camp emphasizes that state and religion have historically recognized and endowed heterosexual marriage with special privileges because such unions can produce children and so are worthy of special protections. These thinkers reject the idea that two self-interested individuals, unable to produce children together, should be entitled to the same benefits as heterosexuals. Because these conservative communitarians seem unable to imagine that gay and lesbian families might perform the same functions as traditional heterosexual ones, their arguments seem to be based more on religious conviction and heteronormative myopia than on reasoned arguments (Snyder 2006).

Finally, in contrast to such for and against approaches, some academics on the left want to move beyond the idea of marriage as constitutive of family and worthy of special benefits from the state. There are several aspects to this line of critique. First, coming from a queer theory perspective, these critics fear the emphasis on marriage will create a strong push for normalization within the LGBTQ community that will further marginalize and stigmatize sex and gender radicals, reinforcing the Good Gay versus Bad Queer dichotomy. Such an assimilationist push, they argue, would weaken or possibly destroy queer culture as it has developed over the years in places like New York City and San Francisco.

Second, this school of thought rejects the contention that the state should regulate sexuality and personal relationships at all. As long as the state bestows benefits on married couples, they argue, people's choices will not be truly free. Moreover, legalizing same-sex marriage will reify the denial and recognition of relationships beyond the monogamous dyad.

Third, because heterosexual marriage has historically been the lynchpin of gender inequality, the institution should not be propped up but rather replaced by a more egalitarian model. The emphasis on marriage within the LGBTQ community constricts the possibility of a more progressive vision that allows all types of relationships to flourish (Lehr 1999).

CLAIRE SNYDER-HALL

References

- Elshtain, Jean Bethke. 1991. "Against Gay Marriage—II: Accepting Limits." *Commonweal*. 118, no. 22: 685–6.
- Eskridge, William N., Jr. 1996. *The Case for Gay Marriage: From Sexual Liberty to Civilized Commitment*. New York: Free Press.
- Galston, William. 1995. "Liberal Virtues and the Formation of Civic Character." In *Seedbeds of Virtue: Sources of Competence, Character, and Citizenship in American Society*, edited by Mary Ann Glendon and David Blankenhorn, 35–61. Lanham, MD: Madison Books.
- Gerstmann, Evan. 2008. *Same-Sex Marriage and the Constitution*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lehr, Valerie. 1999. *Queer Family Values: Debunking the Myth of the Nuclear Family*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Sandel, Michael J. 1996. *Democracy's Discontent: American in Search of a Public Philosophy*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Snyder, R. Claire. 2006. *Gay Marriage and Democracy: Equality for All*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Sullivan, Andrew. 1995. *Virtually Normal: An Argument About Homosexuality*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Vaid, Urvashi. 1996. *Virtual Equality: The Mainstreaming of Gay and Lesbian Liberation*. New York: Anchor Doubleday.
- Warner, Michael. 1999. *The Trouble with Normal: Sex, Politics, and the Ethics of Queer Life*. New York: Free Press.
- West, Robin. 1998. "Gay Marriage and Liberal Constitutionalism: Two Mistakes." In *Debating Democracy's Discontents: Essays on American Politics, Law, and Public Philosophy*, edited by Anita L. Allen and Milton C. Regan, Jr., 260–70. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

111. Mass strike

A mass strike is the withholding of labor power by a large section of the work force with the aim of promoting reforms and/or revolutionary transformation on a municipal, regional, or national level. It is distinguished from periodic strikes against a single industry or employer (as in those preceding or following contract negotiations) or one-day work stoppages (as with May Day). Mass strikes can center on political demands or economic ones, depending on the historical and social context. In its more radical manifestations, it combines both types of demands, posing a serious challenge to existing society – and in some cases, enabling the creation of a new one.

The theory and practice of the mass strike arose in response to disparities generated by the industrial revolution. It was first proposed by William Benbow, an English radical, in *Grand National Holiday* (1832), which was adopted by the Chartist Congress of 1839 and implemented by them in 1842 in a massive strike which involved half a million workers (Black and Ford 2012, 89). While the hopes of radical Chartists (such as George Julian Harney) that a mass strike would produce an anti-capitalist insurrection were not realized, many anarchist currents in Italy, Spain, and Belgium later seized upon the mass strike as the vehicle for inducing social revolution.

A different variant of the mass strike arose in 1864–65, with the flight of Black laborers from plantations in the Southern states in anticipation of the arrival of the Union Army. Following Marx's contention that U.S. slavery was of critical importance in the global accumulation of capital, W.E.B. Du Bois (1998, 63) held that the spontaneous withholding of Black labor "held an even more strategic importance" than the actions of white workers.

Mass strikes occurred in the following decades – some spontaneous, some organized by trade unions or political parties – in St. Louis (1877), New Orleans (1892), and Belgium (1886 and 1893, largely promoted by anarchists, and 1902, led by the Belgian Labor Party). The greatest instantiation of the mass strike was the Russian Revolution of 1905 – in which millions of workers and peasants engaged in general strikes that came close to overthrowing the Tsar.

Rosa Luxemburg (2021, 242) developed a distinctive *theory* of the mass strike in holding that its depth and breadth in 1905 was not an exceptional event but rather "a universal form of the class struggle resulting from the contemporary stage of capitalist development." Mass strikes are not conjured up by the slogans of political parties or the daring acts of individuals; they emerge spontaneously, on the basis of years of patient work of fostering class consciousness. She held that the way mass strikes in Russia combined political and economic demands proved the inadequacy of the anarchist dismissal of political action in favor of insurrection and the reformist socialist preoccupation with parliamentarism. The mass strike is a *school of revolution* that prepares workers for the exercise of political power where a transition to socialism is not yet on the agenda (as in Russia) while enabling the seizure of the means of production where it is on the agenda (as in the "advanced" economies of Western Europe).

Luxemburg's effort to extend the mass strike to Germany largely fell on deaf ears. Most reformists opposed the mass strike altogether, while centrists accepted it only insofar as it is used to defend political democracy. As political reaction set in after 1907, revolutionary social democrats like Karl Kautsky also distanced themselves from the mass strike on the grounds that it is applicable only to pre-revolutionary situations. The intense debates within the Socialist International on this issue between 1907 and 1914 has many lessons for today's efforts to reconstitute democratic socialism.

Several years after its founding in 1905, the Industrial Workers of the World embraced the mass strike as the way to seize control of the workplace from capitalists. Mass strikes occurred in Sweden (1909), Zurich (2012), Australia (1912 and 1917), and Brazil and Spain (1917). The Russian Revolution of 1917 and the German uprising of 1918 inspired a series of mass strikes – in Seattle, Winnipeg, and Barcelona (1919) and the United Kingdom (1926). Though many of these mass strikes were defeated, others won vital concessions. In 1936, Spanish workers and peasants occupied the workshops to reorganize social life *prior* to the seizure of power – at the same time as sit-down strikes and factory occupations occurred in France and

the U.S., as well as in Latin America and Asia.

In the post-World War II era, as the labor movement received official recognition in some countries and suffered extreme repression in others, mass strikes became rarer. But some came close to toppling governments – as in France (1968), when millions of workers joined students on strike. Mass strikes brought down governments in Czechoslovakia (1989), Bolivia (2000 and 2003), and Tunisia and Egypt (2012). The largest strike in history – with 250 million people participating – occurred in India (2020) in response to efforts to impose a series of anti-labor laws.

Many mass strikes in recent years differ from previous ones in that they are not exclusively tied to the labor movement but involve protests and walkouts by a diverse array of the citizenry. This may be in keeping with Luxemburg's contention that mass strikes assume particular forms given the contempo-

rary stage of capitalist development. As the role of the industrial working class recedes, while commodification and social alienation extend to virtually every arena of everyday life, the mass strike takes on new and often unexpected forms. The global climate strikes against environmental destruction (2019, 2020, and 2011) is a case in point.

PETER HUDIS

References

- Black, Dave and Ford, Chris. 2012. *1839: The Chartist Insurrection*. London: Unkant.
- Du Bois, W.E.B. 1998. *Black Reconstruction in America, 1860–1880*. New York: International Publishers.
- Luxemburg, Rosa. 2021. *The Mass Strike, the Political Party, and the Trade Unions*. In *The Complete Works of Rosa Luxemburg, Vol. 4: Political Writings 1906–09*, edited by Peter Hudis and Sandra Rein. Verso: London and New York.

112. Migration

The term “migration” is a relatively new concept within political science and it has a relatively short history within the discipline. At its core, human migration refers to the actual process of moving or relocating from one place to another place. This movement can be either permanent or temporary. It can be from one country to another, which is called international migration, or within the same country, which is called internal migration and it usually occurs in the context of urban-rural movements or internal displaced peoples (IDPs). Those that take part in migration are called migrants. Within the system of international migration governance and nation-states, migrants can either be deemed “regular,” which means they have acquired a legal status to enter the country to which they are migrating; or deemed “irregular” which means they are seeking entry without a legal status and without the nation-state’s authority.

The dominant theories of migration began with neoclassical economics, which were heavily influenced by Ernest George Ravenstein’s “The Laws of Migration” (1889). These theories referred to international migration in terms of economic labor movements, where the individual (male) rational actor migrated after a cost-benefit analysis showed positive net returns and maximum utility from international movement. These economic explanations were not so much a migration theory *per se*, but rather economic development and labor theories found in W. Arthur Lewis’s “Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour” (1954) or Michael P. Todaro’s “A Model of Labor Migration and Urban Unemployment in Less Developed Countries” (1969) and were used to account for the characteristics found in migratory flows after the period of the Second World War. This international migration was linear, where migrants settled and assimilated into their new society.

The international context began to change, however, first with decolonization (1950s–1970s) and then with globalization (1990–). The dominant theories of migration were challenged for their various shortcomings and taken-for-granted assumptions. First, economic theories of labor migration

presupposed that this movement was individual, rational, and voluntary. Therefore, they did not consider forced migration and displacement, which are involuntary movements caused by factors such as war, conflict, generalized direct or indirect violence, and more recently, climate change; all movements that are not economically motivated forms of migration. Simple economic push-pull dichotomies do not acknowledge the socio-political dimensions that impact human mobility. Additionally, with an exclusive emphasis on labor migration, there was an assumption that all migrants who are moving are regular migrants with legal statuses, and their movement was not restricted by barriers to entry. However, there is a whole population that moves irregularly and confronts heightened border security and enforcement, especially with the increase of the securitization of migration (Huysmans and Squire 2009; Walters 2010). Since the early 1990s, there has been a change in the perception of migration in international relations, especially irregular migration, whereby it is viewed as a security issue and framed as a threat to national security.

Economic theories dependent on rational choice also favor individual actions over structural constraints again pushing an either-or dichotomy. However, Castles and Miller (2009) point to the intricate relationships between structure and agency and their co-constitutive nature. Migration is more of a system or a network beyond the micro-level and encompasses “interconnected sets of circumstances ... both social structures and individual actions, as well as an intermediate level of agents ... in the decision-making processes and the outcomes of migration” (O’Reilly 2016, 4). Consequently, migration scholars also began to question linear processes of movement and processes of assimilation. Terms such as “circular migration” and “transnational migration” were utilized to account for not only temporary migratory flows but also regular travel back and forth across borders. Circular migration refers to a temporary and usually repetitive form movement where migrants come into a host country for a defined period of time, typically for seasonal work, and then return to their home country. Transnational migration (Glick-Shiller, Basch, and Blanc-Szanton 1992) refers to the process of moving back

and forth between nation-states and therefore linking together both home and host country.

These new migration terms also call into question the concept of assimilation, which assumed that migrants became acculturated into the culture of the society to which they immigrated. The main critique of assimilation centers on the fact that it tends to treat immigrants as inherently “other” and thus they must not only give up their own cultures, but change and adapt to a white, Western European, middle-class culture as the norm (Nelson and Hiemstra 2008). Transnationalism reconceptualizes the concept of belonging by highlighting how migrants maintain their identities, cultures, and social networks across borders and create new linkages and communities between different nation-states that span geographic, cultural, and political borders.

Lastly, these early theories of migration disregard the feminization of migration by generally considering women to be passive reactors to male “breadwinner” migratory decisions. However, globally, female migration is virtually equal to that of males (Donato et al. 2006). According to the United Nations Development Program (2009), since the 1980s there has been an increase in the number of women, both single and married, who have been moving independently and unaccompanied by a male. Feminist scholars (Pessar 2005; Donato et al. 2006; Kofman 2004) argue that migration is a gendered experience and scholars should not assume that women simply migrate to reunite with the traditional male breadwinner.

CARLA ANGULO-PASEL

References

- Castles, S., and M.J. Miller. 2009. *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*, 4th edn. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Donato, Katharine M., Donna Gabaccia, Jennifer Holdaway, Martin Manalansan, and Patricia R. Pessar. 2006. “A Glass Half Full? Gender in Migration Studies.” *International Migration Review* 40 no. 1: 3–26.
- Glick-Shiller, Nina, Linda Basch, and Cristina Blanc-Szanton. 1992. “Towards a Transnational Perspective on Migration: Race, Class, Ethnicity, and Nationalism Reconsidered.” *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 645: 1–24.
- Huysmans, Jef, and Vicki Squire. 2009. “Migration and Security.” In *Handbook of Security Studies*, edited by Myriam Cavelti Dun and Victor Mauer, 169–79. London: Routledge.
- Kofman, Eleonore. 2004. “Gendered Global Migrations.” *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 6, no. 4: 643–65.
- Lewis, W. Arthur. 1954. “Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour.” *Manchester School of Economic and Social Studies* 22, no. 2: 139–91.
- Nelson, Lise, and Nancy Hiemstra. 2008. “Latino Immigrants and the Renegotiation of Place and Belonging in Small Town America.” *Social & Cultural Geography* 9, no. 3: 319–42.
- O'Reilly, Karen. 2016. “Migration Theories: A Critical Overview.” In *Routledge Handbook of Immigration and Refugee Studies*, 1–10. Routledge International Handbooks. New York: Routledge.
- Pessar, Patricia. 2005. “Women, Gender, and International Migration Across and Beyond the Americas: Inequalities and Limited Empowerment.” UN/POP/EGM-MIG/2005/08. Mexico City, Mexico: UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs.
- Ravenstein, E.G. 1889. “The Laws of Migration.” *Journal of Statistical Society* 52: 214–301.
- United Nations Development Program. 2009. “2009 Human Development Report.” New York: UNDP.
- Todaro, Michael P. 1969. “A Model of Labor Migration and Urban Unemployment in Less Developed Countries.” *American Economic Review* 59, no. 1: 138–48.
- Walters, William. 2010. “Migration and Security.” In *The Routledge Handbook of New Security Studies*, edited by J. Peter Burgess, 217–28. London; New York: Routledge.
- Betts, Alexander. 2011. *Global Migration Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Castles, Stephen. 2010. “Understanding Global Migration: A Social Transformation Perspective.” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36, no. 10: 1565–86.
- Massey, Douglas S., Joaquin Arango, Graeme Hugo, Ali Kouaouci, Adela Pellegrino, and J. Edward Taylor. 2008. *Worlds in Motion: Understanding International Migration at the End of the Millennium*. Oxford and New York: Clarendon Press.

Further readings

113. Mode of production

The mode of production is a concept created by Karl Marx to explain the emergence of capitalism and to distinguish it from earlier stages of the division of labour. Most clearly set out in the Preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (1970 [1859]), the concept refers to the combination of the productive forces (raw materials and labor power) of an age along with its associated property relations, which are understood to be “a legal expression” (Marx 1978a, 4) of the relations of production. As Marx and Engels (1978b, 151) explain in *The German Ideology*: “The various stages in the development of the division of labour are just so many different forms of ownership, i.e., the existing stage in the division of labour determines also the relations of individuals to one another with reference to the material, instrument, and product of labor.”

The concept emerged out of Marx’s (1978c; 1955; 1978d) critiques of G.W.F. Hegel, Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, and the classical political economists for their failure to explain the emergence of civil society; namely, the sphere of private interests that is now referred to as the capitalist economy. Where these other authors sought to explain the emergence of this type of society as the result of human nature or the development of the human mind, Marx (1978a, 4) argued that it was instead the result of a change in “the material conditions of life,” the result of the long process by which mobile private property came to dominate feudal landed property.

The concept’s major innovation is the idea that all human communities are structured by their respective property relations, which are the historically specific social relationships that “govern the relative allocation of rights, responsibilities, and access to particular things” (Prudham and Coleman 2011, 7). These relationships were seen as necessary for Marx because they constituted the rights, claims, and entitlements “to the use and disposal of those goods and services essential to the reproduction of the social unit” (Teeple 2007, 136). In ordering the relations that members of a social formation have to one another in respect to the social product (the totality of what is produced), property relations were also understood to be relations of

power. State forms were not to be understood on their own, but rather as a reflection of the prevailing property relations. As Marx (1844, 8) put it: “the *state* and the *organization* of society are not two different things. The state is the organization of society.” In this view, the state does not possess any content of its own, but is defined by the system of rights that it enforces and defends. The underlying motor that drives history forward is thus the struggles between different social classes as they attempt to challenge the existing system of rights; and as these rights are transformed, so too are the role and shape of political institutions. To put Marx’s theory simply: the history of rights is the history of changing modes of production and their respective social relations.

Marx’s (1992, 1993a, 1993b) most in-depth analysis of a mode of production can be found in the three volumes of *Capital*, where he provides an analysis of the capitalist mode of production using the example of a closed, homogenous, capitalist economy. As some authors point out, this example has led to significant analytical issues because within the theory, “there is no space for any differences in economic conditions between different countries” (Brewer 2002, 26), nor any recognition that within countries there are often multiple modes of production, and thus, different types of property that co-mingle within a single social formation (Althusser et al. 2016). Marx (1881, para. 41) was, of course, aware of these issues in practice, noting, for instance, that the long transition from common to private property does not exist in distinct stages (as when the mode of production is used to periodize), but rather “as in geological formations, these historical forms contain a whole series of primary, secondary, tertiary types.” These issues are further compounded by the fact that Marx often failed to follow his own periodization schema, preferring to explain the different stages of social life not in terms of their unique property relations, but instead by their characteristic methods of production (Balakrishnan 2015). This is exemplified by Marx’s (1955, chap. 2, part 1, second observation, para. 2) now famous quote that “the hand-mill gives you society with the feudal lord; the steam-mill, society with the industrial capitalist.”

As a result of these issues, there has been considerable debate over the modes them-

selves, their characterization, and whether they accurately reflect how early social formations reproduced themselves (e.g., Banaji 2010; Graeber and Wengrow 2021). Some scholars have attempted to resolve these issues by seeing the main dividing line between earlier modes of production, where “the main relationship of dominance and system of surplus expropriation ... consists of peasants giving surplus ... to lords, in various forms, under the at least implicit threat of violence” (Wickham 2021, 9), and the capitalist mode of production, where coercion takes an explicitly economic form (Wood 2002). In this sense, the feudal mode of production can be seen to apply not just to a specific period of European history, but as one that has “dominated nearly the whole of human history since class society appeared” (Wickham 2008, 5). These sorts of dividing line problems can similarly be seen in recent debates over the novelty of globalization, with the mode of production used to support two conflicting positions: (1) that globalization is nothing new, because the dominant mode of production remains capitalist (Lacher 2006; Tabb 2009; Wood 2007); and (2) that globalization represents epochal change because production relations are moving to the transnational level (Hardt and Negri 2000; Robinson 2004, 2014). While it is unlikely that these issues will be resolved soon, the lasting importance of the concept is that it directs our attention to the interplay between the relations of production and technological development as forces of transformation.

JOEL Z. GARROD

References

- Althusser, Louis, Étienne Balibar, Roger Establet, Jacques Rancière, and Pierre Macherey. 2016. *Reading Capital: The Complete Edition*, translated by Ben Brewster and David Fernbach. London: Verso.
- Balakrishnan, Gopal. 2015. “The Abolitionist–II.” *New Left Review*, II, no. 91 (February): 69–100.
- Banaji, Jairus. 2010. *Theory as History: Essays on Modes of Production and Exploitation*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Brewer, Anthony. 2002. *Marxist Theories of Imperialism: A Critical Survey*. London: Routledge.
- Graeber, David, and David Wengrow. 2021. *The Dawn of Everything*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. 2000. *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Lacher, Hannes. 2006. *Beyond Globalization: Capitalism, Territoriality and the International Relations of Modernity*. London: Routledge.
- Marx, Karl. 1844. “Critical Marginal Notes on the Article: ‘The King of Prussia and Social Reform. By a Prussian.’” *Vorwärts!*, August 7, 1844, 63 edition.
- Marx, Karl. 1881. “First Draft of Letter to Vera Zasulich.” March 1881. www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1881/zasulich/.
- Marx, Karl. 1955 [1847]. *The Poverty of Philosophy*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Marx, Karl. 1970 [1859]. *Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, translated from the German by S.W. Ryazanskaya. New York: International Publishers.
- Marx, Karl. 1978a [1844]. “Contribution to the Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right.” In *The Marx-Engels Reader*, edited by Robert C. Tucker, 16–25. New York: Norton.
- Marx, Karl. 1978b [1859]. “Preface to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy.” In *The Marx-Engels Reader*, edited by Robert C. Tucker, 3–6. New York: Norton.
- Marx, Karl. 1978c [1844]. “The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844.” In *The Marx-Engels Reader*, edited by Robert C. Tucker, 66–125. New York: Norton.
- Marx, Karl. 1992 [1867]. *Capital: Volume 1: A Critique of Political Economy*, translated by Ben Fowkes. New York: Penguin Classics.
- Marx, Karl. 1993a [1885]. *Capital: Volume 2: A Critique of Political Economy*, translated by David Fernbach. London: Penguin Classics.
- Marx, Karl. 1993b [1894]. *Capital: Volume 3: A Critique of Political Economy*, translated by David Fernbach. 3rd revised edn. New York: Penguin Classics.
- Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. 1978 [1845–46]. “The German Ideology.” In *The Marx-Engels Reader*, edited by Robert C. Tucker, 146–200. New York: Norton.
- Prudham, Scott, and William Donald Coleman. 2011. “Introduction: Property, Autonomy, Territory, and Globalization.” In *Property, Territory, Globalization: Struggles Over Autonomy*, edited by William Donald Coleman, 1–28. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Robinson, William I. 2004. *A Theory of Global Capitalism: Transnational Production, Transnational Capitalists, and the Transnational State*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Robinson, William I. 2014. *Global Capitalism and the Crisis of Humanity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tabb, William. 2009. “Globalization Today: At the Borders of Class and State Theory.” *Perspectives on Global Development and Technology* 8, no. 2: 121–38.

- Teeple, Gary. 2007. "Honoured in the Breach: Human Rights as Principles of a Past Age." *Studies in Social Justice* 1, no. 2: 136–45.
- Wickham, Chris. 2008. "Productive Forces and the Economic Logic of the Feudal Mode of Production." *Historical Materialism* 16, no. 2: 3–22.
- Wickham, Chris. 2021. "How Did the Feudal Economy Work? The Economic Logic of Medieval Societies." *Past & Present* 251, no. 1: 3–40.
- Wood, Ellen Meiksins. 2002. *The Origin of Capitalism: A Longer View*. New York: Verso.
- Wood, Ellen Meiksins. 2007. "A Reply to Critics." *Historical Materialism* 15, no. 3: 143–70.

114. Mutual aid

Peter Kropotkin's seminal *Mutual Aid: A Factor in Evolution* (1902) is the starting point for naming cooperative endeavors, giving them a social and political reference, and grounding them in a study of the natural world. Kropotkin (1902, 123) points out that "the mutual-aid tendency in man has so remote an origin, and is so deeply interwoven with all the past evolution of the human race, that it has been maintained by mankind up to the present time, notwithstanding all vicissitudes of history." Mutual aid, especially within disasters, such as Hurricane Katrina or 9/11 is the antidote to fear and powerlessness. It gives all of us opportunities to connect with our neighbors, and larger communities, that we may not see in our busy day-to-day lives. It offers us community control as well as community defense that keeps fear at bay and gives us a path toward collective liberation on our own terms.

Liberatory mutual aid draws upon the histories of mutual aid, as practiced by varying communities worldwide, and from principles derived from anarchist and antiauthoritarian traditions. This essay identifies some of the principles involved in creating living and dynamic approaches to mutual aid and collective autonomy.

Liberatory and Insurrectionary Projects and Institutions involves creating dynamic, living organizations and spaces where a movement can have a home and thrive. It is a base for localized power and, as such, these insurrectionary institutions must serve specific needs and come to an end once those needs have been met.

Dual Power in an anarchist context means resisting exploitation and oppression, while also developing initiatives toward autonomy and liberation as part of efforts in self-sufficiency and self-determination. Similar to the Industrial Workers of the World slogan that we have to "build the new society in the shell of the old," dual power embodies the development of institutions, organizations, collectives, liberated work-places, community gardens, neighborhood assemblies, and all the other elements of a future society created in opposition to the dominant power of the state, patriarchy, and capitalism.

Leading by Asking is the principle that no one should pretend to have it all figured out or that any one person knows all the answers to our questions. Mutual aid activists need to ask those in need what they need instead of dictating to them their desires or our solutions. This method is inspired by the practice of the Zapatistas (Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional) in Chiapas, Mexico who have taken this approach to autonomous and collective leadership since they were founded in the early 1980s.

Civil Disobedience and Breaking the Law recognizes that "good laws" do not always make us safer, but can sometimes prevent oppression. Sometimes unjust laws are changed or rendered irrelevant by protest. Other times laws can only be broken. Assessing what is ethical in any given situation is more important than always following the law. Civil disobedience is about more than protesting unjust laws, it is choosing life over always doing what the law says and this is especially true after disasters.

Direct Action is acting without waiting for approval from official authorities. It involves recognizing that it is essential to act in our lives without waiting for a bureaucracy or political movement to give us permission. Direct action can be civil disobedience, but it can also involve creating whole new alternative economic structures. A historic example of direct action is the Diggers in England in the 1600s, who started farming common land to advance their ideals. They did not ask permission from the King, Lords, or Parliament; they just did it.

Solidarity Not Charity is the practice of solidarity which recognizes that our well-beings are tied together in collective action. It presupposes that we engage in solutions *with* those in need, not *for* them. The goal of solidarity is to both alleviate suffering and to solve its systemic deep-rooted causes. Solidarity links us together across geography, economics, culture, and power and it allows those with more access to resources to truly and deeply support, work with, or aid those who do not have access to resources. Solidarity can include sharing resources like knowledge, volunteers, material and monetary aid, as well as raising awareness.

Charity, on the other hand, only addresses symptoms caused by unjust systems; it is just a bandage for deeper societal problems. Through charity, governments, nongovern-

mental organizations, and individuals allow problems to persist by not acting to address the root causes of those problems. It is mere service work that must adhere to, and never challenge, systems of power. Charity is a needed bandage in a world filled with inequalities and suffering, but the idea of charity and its methods often perpetuate problems over the long term.

Collective Autonomy creates the conditions for a hybrid of individual desires/self-interests to be integrated and negotiated within larger groups. The concept allows for various communities to network in strategic alliances, but with each retaining their independence, encouraging a framework where individuals, groups, or communities determine their own futures. Like the anarchist emphasis on healthy individuality being enmeshed within collective solidarity, collective autonomy takes that practice to a more complex level of social organization.

Community Self-Defense in any form is not defined by laws but by ethics based in the need to protect and the principles of anarchy (whether people call it that or not) by which groups of people collectively exercise their power in deciding their futures and determining how to respond to threats without relying on governments. It is the ability of a community to mobilize large numbers of people on short notice and is an expression of solidarity.

Collective Liberation encourages decentralization and power sharing within groups and communities to acknowledge, minimize, or eliminate existing hierarchy and power imbalances so that all people involved can directly participate in decisions and to allow

for personal autonomy within a framework of social equality.

Each of these political principles and practices include a narrative of resistance which can begin to affect a social and cultural shift in capitalist society. It is by talking to each other, holding each other, and developing new practices that the seeds of larger social changes are planted in everyone. By telling new stories we begin to shift larger narratives and impact cultural and social changes, which can eventually result in political change, affecting the power relations in society.

scott crow

Further readings

- Bergman, Rutger, Elizabeth Manton, and Erica Moore. 2020. *Humankind: A Hopeful History*. New York: Little Brown and Company.
- crow, scott. 2016. *Emergency Hearts, Molotov Dreams: A scott crow Reader*. Ohio: GTK Press.
- Graeber, David and David Wengrow. 2021. *The Dawn of Everything: A New History of Humanity*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Grubacic, Andrej and Denis O'Hearn. 2016. *Living at the Edges of Capitalism: Adventures in Exile and Mutual Aid*. Oakland, California: University of California Press.
- Kropotkin, Petr Alekseevich. 1902. *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution*. London: Heinemann.
- Servigne, Pablo and Gauthier Chapelle. 2022. *Mutual Aid: The Other Law of the Jungle*, translated by Andrew Brown. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Spade, Dean. 2020. *Mutual Aid: Building Solidarity During This Crisis (and the Next)*. London and New York: Verso.

115. Nation and nationalism

The origins of the concept of “Nation” goes back to the formation of nation-states in Europe in the late eighteenth century. The rising bourgeoisie, through the French Revolution and others that followed, came to replace feudal fiefdoms with new nation-states that established national boundaries in line with the economic and political interests of the emerging capitalist class (Hobsbawm 1962). Originating in a period when the rising bourgeoisie found it necessary to establish nation-states to protect their economic interests and thus consolidate their class rule, the phenomena of “nation” and “nationalism” became the political expression of the expanding capitalist powers competing to dominate the European and later the world economy. “Nationalism” thus became the battle-cry of the rising bourgeoisie to advance its interests against rival capitalist nation-states across the European continent (Hobsbawm 1992).

The idea of a “nation” as articulated by both conventional and critical social theorists is at once economic and political, as well as social, based on established norms of societal identity that is cultural, linguistic, and historical, as well as territorial. A critical analysis of the origins and development of the nation and nationalism, however, entails an understanding of these concepts in the context of a critical materialist analysis of the dynamics of these phenomena in concrete societal terms. Thus, it is important to understand the social forces behind relations between nation-states to delineate their nature and dynamics. And in more developed class societies, it becomes imperative to examine the class nature of nations and nationalism, especially the relationship between class, state, and nation, as they articulate the nature and dynamics of particular nation-states (Berberoglu 2003).

Classical conventional social theories on the nation and nationalism have adopted subjective/idealist notions based on spiritual sentiments that bind individuals together under a common morality for the existence of a community to which they pay homage (Weber 1944). Critical theories, such as Marxism, on the other hand, have adopted an objective, materialist approach based on

the analysis of concrete class relations and class interests that define the nature of the nation and nationalist movements that are a product of the class structure of particular nation-states and that differ on the basis of their specific class configurations. Thus, in contrast to conservative Hegelian idealist views that glorify the nation and the state on collective moral grounds, as has been done by classical conventional theorists like Ernest Renan, Max Weber, and others, and also by their contemporary counterparts like Ernest Gellner and Anthony Smith (see Gellner 1983 and Smith 2001), the critical materialist view espoused by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels proposes an alternative, class-based view of the nation that stresses the class nature of the state and class divisions in society that explain class struggles and social change. In this view, a nation cannot be conceptualized outside of and independent from the class forces that define its nature.

Nationalism viewed through such class lenses thus becomes revealed as the ideology of the dominant ruling class to advance its own class interests, which are characterized as the national interest, whereas they are in reality the interests of the capitalist class that controls and dominates the state. This is done through the ideological hegemony that this class has secured through control of the major societal institutions to serve its interests and that coincide with its nationally based power as articulated through the state (Marx and Engels 1947). Thus, the historical context of nationalism is in this way bound to the ideology of the nationally based bourgeois ruling class appearing to represent the interests of the people in general; that is, the interests and sentiments of those residing in and viewed as part of the “imagined community” that is called “the nation” (Anderson 1983). And the ideology propagated to sustain that national community by the powers-that-be is presented as “Nationalism.”

Whereas historically nationalism emerged as the ideology of the national capitalist class with the rise of the nation-state in Europe in the late eighteenth century, it became the ideology of the oppressed classes and peoples of the world in their struggle against colonialism and imperialism in the twentieth century. In Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Middle East, workers, peasants, and indigenous peoples across the world have risen in struggle under the banner of national liberation

against imperialism and neo-colonialism to rid their societies of exploitation and oppression by foreign capital and its local corrupt cronies through rebellions and revolutions (Blaut 1987, Berberoglu 1995, 2003). While some of these struggles succeeded and others failed in securing their liberation, they provided great inspiration to people everywhere in their fight for liberation and showed a new way to mobilize an oppressed nation under the banner of “nationalism from below” to determine their destiny.

BERCH BERBEROGLU

References

- Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Berberoglu, Berch. 2003. *Nationalism and Ethnic Conflict: Class, State, and Nation in the Age of Globalization*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Blaut, James. 1987. *The National Question: Decolonizing the Theory of Nationalism*. London: Zed Books.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. 1962. *The Age of Revolution: 1789–1848*. New York: World Publishers.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. 1992. *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gellner, Ernest. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. 1947. *The German Ideology*. New York: International Publishers.
- Smith, Anthony D. 2001. *Nationalism: Theory, Ideology, History*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Weber, Max. 1946. *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, edited by H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills. New York: Oxford University Press.

Further readings

- Amin, Samir. 1980. *Class and Nation, Historically and in the Current Crisis*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Berberoglu, Berch, ed. 1995. *The National Question: Nationalism, Ethnic Conflict, and Self-Determination in the 20th Century*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Davis, Horace B. 1978. *Toward a Marxist Theory of Nationalism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

See also

Theories of the State; Theories of Imperialism; Marxism

116. Neo-colonialism

The *de jure* independence of states, which were previously colonies of the European powers, contradicted the *de facto* constraints on their sovereignty. The economies, governance structures, and borders of these former colonies, particularly in Africa, were the inheritance of colonial occupation. Their internal institutional configurations were designed according to the colonists' prerogatives. Furthermore, their positions within the international division of labor were firmly established prior to formal independence, so that the economic and financial surpluses produced by these former colonies financed the investments of the colonial powers (Baran 1957), while the former colonies remained underdeveloped (Rodney 1972). Furthermore, the Cold War context of the wave of decolonizations that took place from the end of the World War to the end of the 1960s served to further circumscribe formal independence. The colonial powers could justify their continued interventions in the former colonies as "anti-communist" supported by the increasing and ultimately decisive participation of the United States (e.g., Lebanon, Vietnam).

The hostility that greeted efforts to exercise national independence was powerfully symbolized in the kidnap and brutal murder of Patrice Lumumba in 1961, who was the Prime Minister of the newly independent Congo. The optimism and hope characteristic of the early 1960s were frustrated by repeated setbacks that prompted the eventual formulation of the concept of neo-colonialism, which emerged initially from the African experience (Hodges 1972), but became part of an evolving critique of imperialism focused on unequal exchange, resource bondage, and the co-opting and corrupting of local elites by imperialist powers. Jean-Paul Sartre is credited with coining the term "neo-colonialism" in his preface to Frantz Fanon's *The Wretched of the Earth* (1961), where he dismissed the idea that former colonial powers could change their ways (see also, Sartre 1964). Fanon noted the farcical nature of "independence" in Gabon, whose first president, Leon M'ba could say within months of assuming office that "Gabon is an independent country, but nothing has changed between Gabon and France, the status quo continues"

(quoted in Fanon 2004, 28). The authoritarian M'ba was overthrown in a bloodless coup in 1964, only to be re-installed by French troops within days. The contrast with Lumumba's fate could not be starker. Years later, the French journalist Pierre Péan (1983, 20; quoted in Reed 1987, 283) wrote a best-selling book, where he described Gabon as "an extreme case, verging on caricature, of neo-colonialism."

However, in his *Neo-Colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism* (1965), it was Kwame Nkrumah, who as President of Ghana initially made the most significant contribution to developing a formal theory of neo-colonialism. Nkrumah defined neo-colonialism as the external control of a formally independent state's public policies and economic system through public debt, foreign aid, foreign direct investment, and trade agreements. Ghana was the first African colony to achieve formal independence in 1957, but Nkrumah (1965, ix) described the Western foreign aid received by his country as a "revolving credit" that would eventually return to its donor "in the form of increased profits" for European and American multi-national enterprises. Thus, Nkrumah emphasized the urgency of industrialization and indigenously directed economic development in former colonies, and a rejection of any kind of dependence on imperialist powers. In a striking parallel to the overthrow of Indonesia's nationalist President Sukarno the year before (Winters 1996), Nkrumah was deposed in 1966 by a military coup, whose leaders proceeded to invite the World Bank and International Monetary Fund to redesign Ghana's economy.

Neo-colonialism came to be associated mainly with the conditions facing the newly independent states of Africa in contrast to the Latin American origins and focus of dependency theory. The theories differed to the extent that the former emphasized more the role of agency, whereas dependency theory placed greater import on the structure of economic relations. Nevertheless, the two theories converged in the Third Worldism of the Non-Aligned Movement, the 1973 oil shock, and the call for a New International Economic Order (Hudson 2005), which each attempted to forge an autonomous Third World politics outside the bi-polarity of the Cold War. However, the second oil shock of 1979, the aggressive application of mon-

etarist economic policies, and the ending of superpower détente put an end to the NIEO and triggered the 1980s Third World debt crisis.

Notwithstanding the subsequent imposition of devastating structural adjustment policies in accordance with the Washington Consensus, the concept of neo-colonialism fell out of political and academic fashion due at least, in part, to its Marxist content, which was explicitly eschewed by the proponents of a new post-imperialism (Becker and Sklar 1999). Neo-colonialism has even been blamed for providing both excuses for national liberation leaders' and their successors' failure to deliver on their promises of prosperity, and effective rhetorical tools with which competing domestic rivals struggle for power (Gassama 2008). Nevertheless, a strong case for the continuing relevance of neo-colonialism has recently been made by Mark Langan, whose recovery of Nkrumah's core critique highlights the weaknesses of "neo-patrimonialist" treatments that downplay or ignore the external forces that continue to play a significant role in the entrenchment and persistence of dysfunctional, authoritarian regimes and exploitative economic relations in former colonial and underdeveloped countries (Langan 2018; see also Smith 2016).

MICHAEL KEANEY

References

- Baran, Paul A. 1957. *The Political Economy of Growth*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Becker, David G., and Richard L. Sklar, eds. 1999. *Postimperialism and World Politics*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Fanon, Frantz. 2004. *The Wretched of the Earth*, translated by Richard Philcox. New York: Grove Press.
- Gassama, Ibrahim. 2008. "Africa and the Politics of Destruction: A Critical Re-Examination Of Neocolonialism and Its Consequences." *Oregon Review of International Law* 10, no. 2: 327–60.
- Hodges, Norman. 1972. "Neo-Colonialism: The Rape of Africa." *The Black Scholar* 3, no. 5: 12–23.
- Hudson, Michael. 2005. *Global Fracture: The New International Economic Order*, new edition. London: Pluto Press.
- Langan, Mark. 2018. *Neo-Colonialism and the Poverty of 'Development' in Africa*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nkrumah, Kwame. 1965. *Neo-Colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism*. London: Thomas Nelson & Sons.
- Péan, Pierre. 1983. *Affaires Africaines*. Paris: Fayard.
- Reed, Michael C. 1987. "Gabon: A Neo-Colonial Enclave of Enduring French Interest." *Journal of Modern African Studies* 25, no. 2: 283–320.
- Rodney, Walter. 1972. *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. London: Bogle-L'Ouverture Publications.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. 1964. *Situations, V. Colonialisme et Néo-Colonialisme*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Smith, John. 2016. *Imperialism in the Twenty-First Century: Globalization, Super-Exploitation, and Capitalism's Final Crisis*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Winters, Jeffrey A. 1996. *Power in Motion: Capital Mobility and the Indonesian State*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

117. Objectification

Marx defines objectification as the process by which a commodity is produced through human labor applied to nature. The person who labors upon natural resources transforms those resources into something material and, in doing so, objectifies their labor (Marx 1992, 324). In ideal conditions, the process of work that allows for this transformation involves self-actualization: the laborer creates an object that is directly used by them, or by those in their community. However, under capitalism, the objects made by the worker are not owned by the worker and do not manifest themselves as having use-value in their life world, but are instead owned by the capitalist and, thus, appear to the workers only as abstract exchange value in the market. The experience of making exchangeable objects for the capitalist leads to a different experience of objectification. According to Marx, for the worker under capitalism, objectification is not experienced as an affirmative transformation of one's labor into an object that facilitates life. Instead of self-actualization, the wage laborer's energy is externalized into the object of labor so that both labor and its object are experienced as something independent from them and as something that has a power over them. The worker thus experiences "objectification as *loss of and bondage to the object*" and this leads to the experience of alienation (Marx 1992, 324).

Under capitalism, the process of objectification is mechanized and ultimately employed to form, surveil, and instrumentalize workers. In "Reification and Consciousness of the Proletariat," Georg Lukács introduces the notion of rationalization to explain the change that occurs in how labor and the worker are conceived when there is a shift from a cooperative craft-based community to one of industrial manufacturing under capitalism. Lukács explains that rationalization involves a move away from viewing the worker as having individual characteristics and capacities to measuring them as part of a mathematical system in which their value is merely functional and limited to quantitative measurement.

Lukács explains that the wage laborer no longer experiences the objectification of their labor as self-actualization, because the

process of objectification generates commodities that are fundamentally disconnected from their individual needs and abilities. Work involves formalized systems in which any personality or human attribute is subsumed to the interests of production. Thus, "the object of labour becomes a carefully calculated result of a specialized system of operation instead of one crafted by people who perceive their labour to have a specific use value" (Verkerk 2017, 152). The worker becomes estranged from the qualities that define them. As Lukács (1971, 90) elucidates: "the objectification of their labour-power into something opposed to their total personality (a process already accomplished with the sale of that labour-power as a commodity) is now made into the permanent ineluctable reality of their daily life." The experience of self-making through labor is denied, or in Marx's (1992, 329) words, one's "species being" is torn away through estranged labor that "reduces spontaneous and free activity to a means." The wage laborer's human and individual significances are subjugated to the logic of abstract commodity production.

In critical theory, decolonial literature, and feminist philosophy, the concept of objectification is employed to explain a process of dehumanization in which individuals are made into *things* that are defined, controlled, and exploited by the colonial and capitalist hetero-patriarchy. Catharine MacKinnon argues for an analogy between workers and women by building upon the Marxian account and proposing that women experience alienation through sexual objectification. MacKinnon (1982, 516) argues that "as the organized expropriation of the work of some for the benefit of others defines a class – the workers – the organized expropriation of the sexuality of some for the use of others defines the sex, woman" (1982, 516). Instead of sexuality being a source of enjoyment, expression, or empowerment, MacKinnon (1982, 531) explains that the sexuality of women is defined (produced) and appropriated by men as an object for their use. Christine Delphy (1980, 26) has pointed out that the reduction of women to their sexual and reproductive functions has similarly led to the historical devaluation of reproductive and domestic labor as non-productive work and this devaluation has contributed to making women into a subjugated class. However, with the rise of the so-called "free" worker (Lukács 1971, 91)

in “biogenetic capitalism” almost anything can be objectified for profit (Braidotti 2013, 61). This predicament has been exacerbated through surveillance capitalism (Zuboff 2019), which relies on an “informatics of domination” (Haraway 2016, 33) that reduces human beings to objects of data. As Willow Verkerk (2017, 149) observes: “The control of information is in high demand, as is the ability to market, modify, and consume every living and non-living thing.”

The process of objectification, which reduces people to an instrumentalized value, impairs self-determination and is endemic to all forms of domination, dehumanization, and enslavement. Indeed, modernity is founded on a social ontology of race, where Blacks, Indigenous people, and other people of color have been treated as objects and sub-persons through slavery and colonization (Mills 2018, 14–15). In *Black Skin, White Masks*, Frantz Fanon (2008, 89) explains that the colonized subject is a social-economic invention made by the colonist in which a person is made into a thing, “an object among other objects.” By fixing the colonized subject into a “historical racial schema” of racial hierarchies and stereotypes, their self-actualization is impaired both practically and psychologically. Furthermore, under colonization, the land of the colonized is taken away and treated as an object for the extraction of resources to benefit the colonizer. To challenge the injustices of the capitalistic and colonialist hetero-patriarchy, Indigenous struggle seeks to change the relationship between human beings and the land. Glen Coulthard (2014, 13) explains that this involves a “reciprocal” and co-constituting way of relationality between peoples and the land “in nondominating and nonexploitative terms.” These terms may in fact be continuous with the original idea of objectification outlined by Marx, where objectification is not the denial of the life-world but is instead a self-actualization of it, and the community of those who share it together.

WILLOW VERKERK

References

- Braidotti, Rosi. 2013. *The Posthuman*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Coulthard, Glen Sean. 2014. *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Delphy, Christine. 1980. “The Main Enemy.” *Feminist Issues* 1: 23–40.
- Fanon, Frantz. 2008. *Black Skin, White Masks*, translated by Richard Philcox. New York: Grove Press.
- Haraway, Donna. 2016. “A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century.” In *Manifestly Haraway*, edited by Donna Haraway and Cary Wolfe, 3–90. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lukács, Georg. 1971. “Reification and Consciousness of the Proletariat.” In *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*, translated by Rodney Livingston, 83–222. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.
- MacKinnon, Catharine. 1982. “Feminism, Marxism, Method and the State: An Agenda for Theory.” *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 7, no. 3 (Spring): 515–44.
- Marx, Karl. 1992. “Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts (1844).” In *Early Writings*, translated by Rodney Livingstone and Gregor Benton, 279–400. London: Penguin Books.
- Mills, Charles W. 2018. “Black Radical Kantianism.” *Res Philosophica*, 95, no. 1 (January): 1–33.
- Verkerk, Willow. 2017. “Reification, Sexual Objectification, and Feminist Activism.” In *The Spell of Capital: Reification and Spectacle*, edited by Samir Gandesha and Johan Frederik Hartle, 149–62. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Zuboff, Shoshana. 2019. *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. New York: Public Affairs.

See also

Feminist Critiques of Political Science;
Reification; Commodity Fetishism; Alienation

118. Petit bourgeoisie

The words “petit bourgeoisie” translate from the French language as the small middle class – a definition that closely aligns with the description of a fraction of the bourgeoisie that Karl Marx introduced in his writings as the petit (petty) bourgeoisie. Within the tradition of critical political science, the petit bourgeoisie have been a constant focus given their significant role in a variety of political events. To understand the character and political significance of the petit bourgeoisie, it is first necessary to appreciate their historical development in capitalist societies.

In *The German Ideology* (1846), in particular, Karl Marx (1978a, 180) details the genesis of the petit bourgeoisie during the Middle Ages, when a shift in productive forces brought forth a shift in the division of labor in the emerging towns and cities, which in turn led to “rise of manufactures, branches of production which had outgrown the guild system.” The guild system, comprised of associations of merchants and craftsmen, was a powerful force in medieval life, but limited in terms of its financial resources and its reliance on local markets. The introduction of guild-free manufacturing quickly affected property relations in a way that reduced the power and significance of the guilds. Merchants could now accrue wealth from moveable capital; this, accompanied with increased manufacture, allowed for increased mobilization and international trade. Capital was no longer tethered to the land, and colonial expansion and trade provided more resources and increased competition between nations.

Working relations changed as well, such as the political shift from paternalism to the relations of social contract that John Locke (1993 [1689], 140–53) portrays in his *Second Treatise of Government*. Marx describes a similar shift in employee relations under capitalism, with the paternalism of the master-apprentice relationship replaced with the monetary relationship (wages) between capitalist owner and worker. All of this set the stage for the emergence of the petit bourgeoisie: concentrated in the guilds, dependent on estate-capital, and unable to compete with the expanded trade and production of the big bourgeoisie. Thus, by Marx’s description, the bourgeoisie split in two, ideologically,

embodied in the fraction of the petit bourgeoisie, or the small business owners, and materially embodied in the big bourgeoisie, or simply the bourgeoisie.

Thus, the petit bourgeoisie became conservative, or even reactionary, in their attempts to salvage their former glory as part of the dominant middle class as they had once been in the medieval towns. As Marx and Engels note in *The Manifesto of the Communist Party*: “They are therefore not revolutionary, but conservative. Nay more, they are reactionary, for they try to roll back the wheel of history. If by chance they are revolutionary, they are so only in view of their impending transfer into the proletariat” (Marx 1978b, 482). This longing for the past and fear of slipping into the working class is depicted most clearly in Marx’s analyses of the revolutionary events of nineteenth-century France. As Marx (1971a, 177) describes in *The Class Struggles in France, 1848–50*, it was the petit bourgeoisie, “keepers of cafés and restaurants, *marchands de vins*, small traders, shopkeepers, handicraftsmen, etc.” that cleaved most closely to the promises of capitalism, supporting bourgeois interests during the June insurrection of workers in 1848. Yet, as Marx (1971a, 178) notes, in the aftermath of the uprising, big capital turned against them as creditors demanded repayment: “The petty bourgeois saw with horror that by striking down the workers they had delivered themselves without resistance into the hands of their creditors.” Given how they were “rewarded” for their fidelity to bourgeois interests in the aftermath of the uprising, Marx goes on to describe in *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon* (1851–52) how, in 1851, the petty bourgeoisie then aligned themselves with the proletariat in the National Assembly through the promotion of social democracy, which as Marx affirms, broke the revolutionary point off the struggle, stripping it of its political form (Marx 1971b, 268). Thus, by Marx’s account, the petit bourgeoisie’s promotion of social democracy was a liberal-parliamentary attempt to shield itself from the blunt force of big capital and to secure its class position in the face of an impending fall into the ranks of the proletariat.

It is this resentful, conservative, even reactionary character of the petit bourgeoisie that would continue to intrigue twentieth-century Marxist thinkers. Writing during the interwar

period, for example, Leon Trotsky (1996, 8) would call the petit bourgeoisie the “genuine basis” for fascism. Like Marx, Trotsky describes a certain self-regarding nature of the petit bourgeoisie, noting that they are the ones most likely to turn to fascism to defend their interests against big capital. However, for Trotsky, the petit bourgeoisie does not fear revolution in the way depicted by Marx, but instead does not believe in the strength of the working-class parties’ parliamentary machines. As Trotsky observes, the petit bourgeoisie are realists, who see fascism as a fighting force against monopoly capitalism, and it is their psychology that renders them into fodder for fascist demagogues. In this sense, Trotsky (1996 [1944], 34–5) perhaps presents a more optimistic characterization of the petit bourgeoisie – who appear economically dependent and politically atomized in his analysis – noting that with strong proletarian party leadership they can be steered into revolutionary struggle.

Theodor Adorno likewise focuses on the petit bourgeoisie’s susceptibility to fascist agitation. Adorno (2020, 6) observes that the social character of the petit bourgeoisie can be linked to their support of fascist movements and that small business owners whose livelihoods are directly threatened by the corporate retailers are especially susceptible to fascism, although he sees the distribution of fascist tendencies as more widespread and as one that can move beyond small business owners to the general society.

Nicos Poulantzas’s discussion of the new petit bourgeoisie provides an insightful addendum to Adorno’s analysis. Poulantzas (1973, 37) identifies two kinds of petit bourgeoisie in the contemporary context: the “traditional” petit bourgeoisie, which includes small scale producers and traders who are both the owners of the means of production and the direct worker; and the “new” petit bourgeoisie, who are non-productive wage-earning workers far removed from production. It is the new petit bourgeoisie who now make up the greater fraction of the petit bourgeois, and who are likely closer to the working class than the traditional petit bourgeoisie. And while different from the traditional petit bourgeoisie in terms of their relationship to

production, the new petit bourgeoisie share the same ideological and political characteristics, including faith in liberal individualism, the status quo, social advancement, aspiring to bourgeois status, and the politically neutral state; fear of working class revolution, a propensity towards political instability, support of strong states, and support for populist revolts (Poulantzas 1973, 37–8).

In the contemporary context, the new petit bourgeoisie is an expansive category with potentially potent political power because they seemingly have much to lose in the face of socialist transformation and are thus more likely to align with nationalist populist regimes to prevent such change. Marx (1978b, 482) famously named the lumpen-proletariat “the dangerous class,” but perhaps in the context of advanced capitalism one might ask: is it actually the petit bourgeoisie class that is the most dangerous?

KATHERINE E. YOUNG

References

- Adorno, Theodor. 2020. *Aspects of the New Right-Wing Extremism*, translated by Wieland Hoban. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Locke, John. 1993 [1689]. *Two Treatises of Government*, edited by Mark Goldie. London: Everyman Press.
- Marx, Karl. 1971a [1848–50]. “The Class Struggles in France, 1848–50.” In *On Revolution*, edited and translated by Saul K. Padover, 154–242. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Marx, Karl. 1971b [1852]. “The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon.” In *On Revolution*, edited and translated by Saul K. Padover, 243–328. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Marx, Karl. 1978a [1846]. “The German Ideology: Part I.” In *The Marx-Engels Reader*, 2nd edn, edited by Robert C. Tucker, 146–200. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Marx, Karl. 1978b [1848]. “Manifesto of the Communist Party.” In *The Marx-Engels Reader*, 2nd edn, edited by Robert C. Tucker, 469–500. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. 1973. “On Social Classes.” *New Left Review*. 1, 78 (Mar/Apr): 27–54.
- Trotsky, Leon. 1996 [1944]. *Fascism: What it is and How to Fight it*. New York: Pathfinder Press.

119. Policy-planning organizations

Policy-planning organizations are non-profit and non-partisan organizations that seek to influence public policy at all levels of government in the United States. While analogous groups exist in other countries, they appear to have special significance in U.S. politics (Domhoff 2022, 85). Policy-planning organizations, such as the Council on Foreign Relations, and “think tanks” such as the Brookings Institution emerged in the first decades of the twentieth century and expanded in number and influence in several waves after World War II up to the present. In some scholarly accounts, they are centrally connected to the growth of modern social science expertise and the emergence of a “policy elite” (Smith 1991). In a related argument, think tanks “have become the primary instruments for linking political and intellectual practice in American life” (Medvetz 2012, 7).

From the perspective of critical political science, policy-planning organizations may be understood as acting to develop coherent strategies and policy proposals among capitalists and the corporate rich on key issues facing the nation. Thus, these groups should not be seen as repositories of politically neutral, objective scientific “expertise,” but rather as key actors in a “policy-planning process” that is guided by what C. Wright Mills calls “the power elite.” Policy-planning organizations help to explain how the ruling class rules, particularly within the nominal political framework of liberal democracy. Policy-planning organizations are considered important political agents on the grounds that a “structural” account of the capitalist state is insufficient to understand corporate political dominance. In order to respond to the structural power of the capitalist class, state elites must know how to respond and with what policies. Thus, many critical state theorists argue that intentional planning and consensus building are necessary for system maintenance and crisis management by a state in a capitalist society. As G. William Domhoff (2022, 83) puts it: “The issues facing the corporate rich are too complex, and the economy is too large, for new policies to arise naturally

from common interests and social cohesion alone.”

How does the policy-planning process work? In brief, corporations and corporate-backed foundations provide funding to policy-planning organizations, whose boards of trustees often include corporate directors and wealthy capitalists. The policy groups produce reports, testimony, ideas, personnel, and policy recommendations that are disseminated to the news media and directed to relevant congressional committees, government regulatory agencies, executive branch officials, and key government commissions and task forces. In the process, policy-planning organizations perform several important functions for the corporate rich and the capitalist class, such as familiarizing corporate leaders with key policy issues, mediating conflicts between corporate leaders and industries, providing a training ground for aspiring members of the power elite, and legitimizing their members as serious policy experts.

Examples of critical scholarship on policy-planning organizations include Shoup and Minter’s (1977) study of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), which showed how the CFR brought together economic and political elites to lay out plans for the post-World War II international order, and the hegemonic role of the United States within it. More recently, two Dutch scholars have studied the evolution of U.S. grand strategy after the end of the Cold War by tracing how the Clinton, Bush, and Obama administrations pursued an “open door” for U.S. capital around the globe, and analysing the connections of senior foreign policy officials to elite policy-planning networks (Van Apeldoorn and Graaff 2016). Peschek (1987) has examined the role of both centrist and conservative policy-planning organizations in scripting the right turn in American politics that accelerated in the 1970s. Burris (2008) examines how, in the 1980s and 1990s, corporate liberals became more isolated from big business “moderate conservatives” and were replaced by several ultraconservative groups, which has added to our understanding of the right turn in U.S. state policy during that period.

In recent decades, the number of policy-planning organizations has increased in number, as has their political diversity. A left-liberal policy-planning network has

emerged that is funded by labor unions, wealthy philanthropists, and foundations, and which includes organizations such as the Economic Policy Institute and the Institute for New Economic Thinking (INET). On the far right of the ideological spectrum, older policy organizations like the American Enterprise Institute and the Heritage Foundation interact with a vast network of groups connected to the wealth of the Koch family and other wealthy conservatives, including the American Legislative Policy Network and the law-oriented Federalist Society.

JOSEPH G. PESCHEK

References

- Burris, Val. 2008. "The Interlock Structure of the Policy-Planning Network and the Right Turn in U.S. State Policy." *Research in Political Sociology* 17: 3–42.
- Domhoff, G. William. 2022. *Who Rules America? The Corporate Rich, White Nationalist Republicans, and Inclusionary Democrats in the 2020s*, 8th edn. New York and London: Routledge.
- Medvetz, Thomas. 2012. *Think Tanks in America*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Peschek, Joseph G. 1987. *Policy-Planning Organizations: Elite Agendas and America's Rightward Turn*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Shoup, Laurence H. and William Minter. 1977. *Imperial Brain Trust: The Council on Foreign Relations and United States Foreign Policy*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Smith, James A. 1991. *The Idea Brokers: Think Tanks and the Rise of the New Policy Elite*. New York: The Free Press.
- Van Apeldoorn, Bastiaan, and Naná de Graaff. 2016. *American Grand Strategy and Corporate Elite Networks: The Open Door since the End of the Cold War*. London: Routledge.

See also

Capitalist Class; G. William Domhoff; Joseph Peschek; Power; Power Structure Analysis; Ruling Class

120. Postcolonialism

Postcolonialism originated in literary and cultural studies as part of a growing recognition of both the richness of non-European art and culture, and the way in which that richness had been systematically denied, ignored, or appropriated due to the institutionalized racism of Eurocentric imperialism. Postcolonialism's questioning of received wisdom regarding the colonial experience and its legacy gained further impetus from the concurrent growth of postmodernist and post-structuralist theory within the humanities and the social sciences. This was accompanied by the decline of academic Marxism, alongside Soviet decay and western social democracy's capitulation to neoliberalism. Postcolonialism appeared even to supersede the critique of neo-colonialism just as the New International Economic Order and non-aligned "Third Worldism" disintegrated amid the collapse of superpower *détente* and the onset of the Third World debt crisis, beginning with Mexico's sovereign default in 1982.

The publication in 1978 of Edward Said's *Orientalism* (2003 [1978]) is widely regarded as the "catalyst and reference point for postcolonialism" (Ghandi 2019, 64). It laid bare the means by which Western imperialism was able first to exercise cultural power or ideological hegemony, such that "the Orient" was conceptualized first to enable colonizers, actual and aspirant, to achieve a better "understanding" of "inferior races," and second to educate the latter as to their position in the global ranking order, such that they would seek to emulate their colonizers' "civilization." Yet Said (1993, 276) later warned against, and criticized, the reactionary politics of *ressentiment* by which former colonies regress "into combative and dissonant forms of nativism" (Ghandi 2019, 108). This echoed Frantz Fanon's earlier recognition of the dangers inherent in nationalisms that can become nativist, in a sad but ironic inversion of the binary thinking imposed by imperialism, whereby the rank ordering of peoples is up-ended such that the victims become the perpetrators (Fanon 1963, 156). Such inversion is analogous to postcolonialism's encounter with Marxism.

Postcolonialism's porous and amorphous boundaries make it difficult to summarize

satisfactorily what lies within these borders (Ghandi 2019; Young 2016). There is a widely shared rejection of "master narratives," including especially Eurocentrism as expressed via the modernizing narratives of bourgeois liberalism and Marxism (Dirlik 1994, 334; Prakash 1990). Apparent affinity with postmodernism's aversion to grand narratives has facilitated the wider academic acceptance of postcolonial scholarship and scholars. Nevertheless, while the famous question posed by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (1988) – "Can the subaltern speak?" – has been answered in the affirmative, criticisms of postcolonialism's evasion or rejection of capitalism's foundational historical role have sustained ongoing controversy with respect to the interests it ultimately serves (Huggan 1997).

Beginning in 1982, Ranajit Guha's Subaltern Studies group began challenging the prevailing historiographies of colonialism and its aftermath. These assumed unified political fields by superimposing universalizing categories of thought such that history was the history of elites. Yet the work of Guha and colleagues, having originated in Marxism, became increasingly critical of the approach to the extent that their treatment of capitalism itself was accused of conflating the material with the cultural. However, Chibber's (2013) Marxist assault on subaltern studies' key works (Guha 1998; Chakrabarty 2000; Chatterjee 1993) was summarily dismissed as tone deaf to its own Eurocentrism (Spivak 2014). Harry Harootunian's careful excavation of Marx's writings on formal and real subsumption, and the persistence of unevenness in an otherwise universalizing capitalist development process, refutes both Western Marxism's stagist teleology of development and more general universalism, and the tendency within postcolonialism to "exceptionalize culture," whilst treating Marxism "as simply a Western imposition to coerce and corral the authentic historical experience of (the Third World) into a narrative compound not of their own making" (Harootunian 2015, 226, 227).

Postcolonial challenges to conventional historiography have also addressed social pathologies of imperial decline within the "overdeveloped" world. Just as Stuart Hall (1990, 12) traced the origins of cultural studies to an effort to make sense of the social and cultural changes in Britain following the

Second World War, Paul Gilroy (2005) has highlighted the racism inherent in the intensification of militarism and revanchist deployment of imperial iconography in mainstream public discourse, anticipating its culmination in the Brexit revolt of 2016.

MICHAEL KEANEY

References

- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2000. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Chatterjee, Partha. 1993. *The Nation and its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Chibber, Vivek. 2013. *Postcolonial Theory and the Specter of Capital*. London: Verso.
- Dirlik, Arif. 1994. "The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism." *Critical Inquiry* 20, no. 2 (Winter): 328–56.
- Fanon, Frantz. 1963. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press.
- Ghandi, Leela. 2019. *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*, 2nd edn. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gilroy, Paul. 2005. *Postcolonial Melancholia*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Guha, Ranajit, ed. 1982. *Subaltern Studies*, Volume 1. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Guha, Ranajit. 1998. *Dominance without Hegemony: History and Power in Colonial India*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hall, Stuart. 1990. "The Emergence of Cultural Studies and the Crisis of the Humanities." *October* 53 (Summer): 11–23.
- Harootunian, Harry. 2015. *Marx After Marx: History and Time in the Expansion of Capitalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Huggan, Graham. 1997. "The Neocolonialism of Postcolonialism: A Cautionary Note." *Links and Letters* 4: 19–24.
- Prakash, Gyan. 1990. "Writing Post-Orientalist Histories of the Third World: Perspectives from Indian Historiography." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 32, no. 2: 383–408.
- Said, Edward W. 1993. *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Chatto & Windus.
- Said, Edward W. 2003 [1978]. *Orientalism*, 25th anniversary edition. New York: Viking.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1988. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, edited by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, 21–78. Urbana and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 2014. Review of "Postcolonial Theory and the Specter of Capitalism." *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 27, no. 1: 184–98.
- Young, Robert J. C. 2016. *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*, 15th anniversary ed. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell.

121. Post-Marxism

The term “Post-Marxism” was first used in Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe’s (1985, 5) *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*, who injected ambiguity into the term from the outset by distinguishing between *post-Marxist* and *post-Marxist* political theory (Sim 2001, 1–2). Laclau and Mouffe identified *post-Marxism* with schools of thought that explicitly rejected Marxism, such as deconstructionism and post-structuralism (Derrida, Laclau, and Mouffe), post-modernism (Lyotard, Foucault, Baudrillard, Deleuze, and Guattari), and second wave feminists (Hartmann, Butler, Haraway). The apparent rise of political groups formerly perceived as marginal to the dynamics of capitalist society seemed to require a “new left” political theory with the capacity to either go beyond traditional Marxism conceptually or to replace Marxist political theory altogether. However, the development of a distinct and identifiable *post-Marxist* political theory was one of the numerous responses to this crisis of historical materialism.

Significantly, the emergence of *post-Marxist* political theory occurred in conjuncture with the rise of post-industrial social theories, which the new left first began to take seriously with the publication of Alain Touraine’s *The Post-Industrial Society* (1971) and Daniel Bell’s *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society* (1973). These two theoretical innovations merged intellectually in the writings of radical social theorists such as Andre Gorz, Jürgen Habermas, Antonio Negri, and Claus Offe, who began to explore the theoretical implications of post-industrialism through the lens of classical Marxist theory. This fusion of the new left political critique of classical Marxism with post-industrial social theory resulted in a distinctly *post-Marxist* political theory that is conceptually distinct from post-modernism and post-structuralism.

Stuart Sim (2001, 5) argues that the effort to grapple with “the decline in importance, both socially and politically, of the working class” in post-industrial society is the key theoretical problem shared by both *post-Marxism* and *post-Marxism*. However, Sim (1998, 7) also observes that what distinguishes *post-Marxists* from *post-Marxists* is that for *post-Marxists* Marxism remains

“at the very least, the point of departure for their theoretical speculations.” While Sim considers the *post-Marxists*’ effort to retain a theoretical anchor in Marx’s writings as nothing more than “nostalgia” and a “romantic gesture” to the past, Sim’s analysis fails to recognize the central role of *Grundrisse*, as opposed to *Capital*, in establishing an identifiable *post-Marxist* position that anchors its analysis of the capitalist economy, politics, and the state in *Marxian* political economy.

In fact, the discovery of *Grundrisse* by Western Marxists arguably generated a shift in thinking about Marx and Marxism as dramatic as the one that occurred after the discovery of Marx’s early writings, such as the *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844* and *The German Ideology*, because it opened a lens onto a post-industrial Marx, who envisioned a future where technology would displace labor as the primary producer of value. Gorz (1986, 9) concludes that in late capitalism “the tendency that Marx (within quite different parameters) described as ‘the rise in organic composition of capital’ was thus borne out in the increasing substitution of constant (fixed) capital for variable (circulating) capital.” In this respect, the orthodox Marxist analysis of late capitalism correctly forecast a deep, recurring, and protracted crisis of capitalism but, according to Gorz (1986, 6), because the socialists’ solution to that crisis was anchored in the continuing advance of organized labor they were incapable of “breaking from the logic of capitalism.” This is not to say that the conceptual tools for such a break could not be found in Marx, but that articulating these concepts required Marxists to “break with the law of value.” As Offe (1984, 283) notes, such a break implies that assumptions “about the centrality of labour within classical Marxism must also be questioned.” Importantly, Marx often questions this assumption in the *Grundrisse* as documented by Gorz, Offe, Habermas, and Negri. Such a break in the law of value undermines the foundation of economic reasoning in *Capital*. Specifically, Gorz (1986, 29, 33, 45) finds that “the disappearance of market laws (as Marx showed in the *Grundrisse*), just like the disappearance of the law of value, is an inevitable consequence of automation.”

Consequently, the most fundamental distinction between *post-Marxism* and other “post-theories” is the idea that Marxian concepts *are still necessary, if not sufficient* for

understanding post-industrial and global capitalism. More specifically, Gorz, Habermas, Negri, and Offe, among others, articulate the foundations of a uniquely post-Marxist political theory by anchoring their economic analysis of capitalism in Marx's *Grundrisse* rather than *Capital*. This conceptual shift made it possible to construct a theoretically powerful analysis of post-industrial capitalism, the new social movements, and socialist strategy, while drawing on the most basic insight of classical Marxism. Nevertheless, absent the working class, post-Marxists have struggled without success to identify a new revolutionary subject capable of fulfilling the historic role previously assigned to the proletariat.

CLYDE W. BARROW

References

- Bell, Daniel. 1973. *The Coming of Postindustrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gorz, Andre. 1986. *Paths to Paradise: Essays on the Liberation from Work*. Boston: South End Press.
- Laclau, Ernesto and Chantal Mouffe. 1985. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.
- Offe, Claus. 1984. *Contradictions of the Welfare State*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.
- Sim, Stuart. ed. 1998. *Post-Marxism: A Reader*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Sim, Stuart. 2001. *Post-Marxism: An Intellectual History*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Touraine, Alain. 1971. *The Post-Industrial Society*. New York: Random House.
- Aronowitz, Stanley. 1981. *The Crisis of Historical Materialism: Class, Politics, and Culture in Western Marxist Theory*. New York: Praeger.
- Aronson, Ronald. 1995. *After Marxism*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Callinicos, Alex, Stathis Kouvelakis, and Lucia Predella. eds. 2021. *Routledge Handbook of Marxism and Post-Marxism*. New York: Routledge.
- Frankel, Boris. 1987. *The Post-Industrial Utopians*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Geras, Norman. 1987. "'Post-Marxism'?" *New Left Review* 163: 40–82.
- Negri, Antonio. 1991. *Marx Beyond Marx: Lessons on the Grundrisse*, edited by Jim Fleming and translated by Harry Cleaver, Michael Ryan, and Maurizio Viano. Brooklyn, NY: Autonomedia, 1991).
- Therborn, Goran. 2008. *From Marxism to Post-Marxism?* London: Verso.

Further readings

- Aronowitz, Stanley. 1981. *The Crisis of Historical Materialism: Class, Politics, and Culture in Western Marxist Theory*. New York: Praeger.
- Aronson, Ronald. 1995. *After Marxism*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Callinicos, Alex, Stathis Kouvelakis, and Lucia Predella. eds. 2021. *Routledge Handbook of Marxism and Post-Marxism*. New York: Routledge.
- Frankel, Boris. 1987. *The Post-Industrial Utopians*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Geras, Norman. 1987. "'Post-Marxism'?" *New Left Review* 163: 40–82.
- Negri, Antonio. 1991. *Marx Beyond Marx: Lessons on the Grundrisse*, edited by Jim Fleming and translated by Harry Cleaver, Michael Ryan, and Maurizio Viano. Brooklyn, NY: Autonomedia, 1991).
- Therborn, Goran. 2008. *From Marxism to Post-Marxism?* London: Verso.

See also

- Andre Gorz; Jürgen Habermas; Claus Offe; Marxism; Systems Analysis; Postmodernism; Poststructuralism

122. Postmodernism

Intellectual movements are defined by their fundamental philosophical premises. Those premises state what it takes to be *real*, what it is to be *human*, what is *valuable*, and how *knowledge* is acquired. In other words, any intellectual movement has a metaphysics, a conception of human nature and values, and an epistemology. The term “postmodern” situates the movement historically and philosophically against modernism. Thus, understanding what postmodernism sees itself as rejecting and moving beyond is helpful in formulating a definition of postmodernism. The modern world has existed for several centuries, so we have good sense of what defines modernism.

Modernism

In philosophy, modernism’s essentials are located in the formative figures of Francis Bacon (1561–1626) and René Descartes (1596–1650), for their influence upon epistemology, and more comprehensively in John Locke (1632–1704), for his influence upon all aspects of philosophy. Bacon (1900), Descartes (2019), and Locke (1997) are modern because of their philosophical *naturalism*, their profound confidence in *reason*, and, especially in the case of Locke, their *individualism*. Modern thinkers start from nature – instead of starting with some form of the supernatural, which had been the characteristic starting point of pre-modern, Medieval philosophy. Modern thinkers stress that perception and reason are the human means of knowing nature – in contrast to the pre-modern reliance upon tradition, faith, and mysticism. Modern thinkers stress human *autonomy* and the human capacity for forming one’s own character – in contrast to the pre-modern emphasis upon dependence and original sin. Modern thinkers emphasize the *individual*, seeing the individual as the unit of reality, holding that the individual’s mind is sovereign, and that the individual is the unit of value – in contrast to the pre-modernist, feudal subordination of the individual to higher political, social, or religious realities and authorities.

Modern philosophy came to maturity in the Enlightenment. The Enlightenment *philosophes* rightly saw themselves as radical.

The pre-modern Medieval worldview and the modern Enlightenment worldview were coherent, comprehensive, and opposed accounts of reality and the place of human beings within it. Medievalism had dominated the West for 1000 years, from roughly 400 CE to 1400 CE. In a centuries-long transition period, the thinkers of the Renaissance, with some unintended help from the major Reformation figures, undermined the Medieval worldview and paved the way for the revolutionaries of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. By the eighteenth century, the pre-modern philosophy of Medieval era had been routed intellectually, and the *philosophes* moved quickly to transform society on the basis of the new, modern philosophy.

Postmodernism versus modernism

The *postmoderns* consciously and emphatically reject the Enlightenment project, especially its foundational confidence in the power of reason to reach truth and sophisticated theoretical knowledge. French postmodernist Jean-François Lyotard (1984, xxiv) influentially defined the “postmodern as incredulity toward metanarratives,” the Enlightenment being the great metanarrative of modernity. British postmodernist John Gray (1995, 145) asserted that “We live today amid the dim ruins of the Enlightenment project, which was the ruling project of the modern period.” Accordingly, stated French postmodernist Michel Foucault (1973, xxiv), “The deepest strata of Western culture” have been exposed and are “once more stirring under our feet.” And consequently, American postmodernist Richard Rorty (1982, 175) said that the postmodern task is to figure out what to do “now that both the Age of Faith and the Enlightenment seem beyond recovery.”

Postmodernism is a movement of thinkers who agree, in varying degrees, with these philosophical views: *Metaphysically*, postmodernism is anti-realist, holding that it is impossible to speak meaningfully about an independently existing reality. Postmodernism substitutes instead a social-linguistic, constructionist account of reality. *Epistemologically*, having rejected the notion of an independently existing reality, postmodernism denies that reason or any other method is a means of acquiring objective knowledge of that reality. Having substituted social-linguistic constructs for that reality,

postmodernism emphasizes the subjectivity, conventionality, and incommensurability of those constructions. Postmodern accounts of *human nature* are consistently collectivist, holding that individuals' identities are constructed largely by the social-linguistic groups that they are a part of, those groups varying radically across the dimensions of sex, race, ethnicity, and wealth. Postmodern accounts of human nature also consistently emphasize relations of conflict between those groups; and given the de-emphasized or eliminated role of reason, postmodern accounts hold that those conflicts are resolved primarily by the use of force, whether masked or naked; the use of force in turn leads to relations of dominance, submission, and oppression. Finally, postmodern themes in *ethics and politics* are characterized by an identification with and sympathy for the groups perceived to be oppressed in the conflicts, and a willingness to enter the fray on their behalf.

STEPHEN R.C. HICKS

References

Bacon, Francis. 1900. *Advancement of Learning; and Novum Organum*. London: Colonial Press.

- Descartes, René. 2019. *Discourse on Method, Meditations of First Philosophy, and Principle of Philosophy*. Whithorn, UK: Anodos Books.
- Foucault, Michel. 1973 [1966]. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Gray, John. 1995. *Enlightenment's Wake: Politics and Culture at the Close of the Modern Age*. New York: Routledge.
- Locke, John. 1997. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. London: Penguin Books.
- Lyotard, Jean-Francois. 1984. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, translated by Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Rorty, Richard. 1982. *Consequences of Pragmatism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Further readings

- Hicks, Stephen R.C. 2011. *Explaining Postmodernism: Skepticism and Socialism from Rousseau to Foucault*. Durham, N.C.: Scholarly Publishing.
- Ross, Andrew, ed. 1988. *Universal Abandon?: The Politics of Postmodernism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

See also

Post-Structuralism; Michel Foucault; Jean-Francois Lyotard; Gilles Deleuze

123. Poststructuralism

A basic assumption of poststructuralist analysis is that politics can be located and identified everywhere, and it can be sensed through our sight, touch, smell, taste, and sound (Wiebe 2017, 2023). In other words, everything is political and charged with political meaning. Thus, poststructural inquiry interrogates the presumption that institutions, discourses, and social practices can be interpreted or understood as unbiased, value free, or politically neutral. A poststructural mode of inquiry sheds light on the facets, edges, nuances, and lived-experiences of power relations in a range of settings, including formal institutions such as legislative assemblies and bureaucracies, but also through the capillaries of societies and the appendages of governing systems, such as hospitals, airports, museums, and educational institutions, to name but a few.

As a mode of critical and creative inquiry, poststructuralist scholars in political science, policy studies, and public administration attune themselves to asking questions about *how* power operates and *through* which channels it operates in society. Poststructural analysis tends to align itself with interpretive policy analysis to interrogate dominant, hegemonic narratives, challenge rigid linearity, blur boundaries, and punctuate paradoxes. Interpretive policy analysis necessarily involves emotions, language, and ethnography and thus language carries political weight, which is often imbued with power relations regarding how particular issues or communities become framed in politics and policy.

One of the most salient contributions of interpretive poststructural inquiry to critical policy studies are critiques of hierarchical power relations. Many studies contributing to this body of knowledge emerge from the works of the late social theorist Michel Foucault. His concepts of governmentality, genealogy, biopower, and *dispositif*, among others, continue to catch the attention of numerous critical policy studies scholars (Bacchi and Goodwin 2016; Brady 2011; McKee 2009; Orsini and Smith 2007; Teghtsoonian 2009). Poststructural approaches to policy analysis enhance the field of critical policy studies by challenging the neutrality of institutions, interrogating discursive power relations, and

examining how individuals, groups, and communities become entangled within these relations of power. This mixing of institutional, discursive, and practices of power relations can be understood as a “policy assemblage” (Wiebe 2017). An assemblage is similar to what Foucault calls a *dispositif*, an oftentimes uncanny mixing of disparate “things” – organizations, capital, policies, citizen, or foreigner encounters with administrative rules among others, woven together to produce uneven power relations. Governmentality studies illuminate how these assemblages, *dispositifs*, or power relations produce certain effects that affect diverse bodies, peoples, and communities in unique ways. Building from Wendy Brown, Bacchi and Goodwin (2016, 5) emphasize how “we live in societies ‘saturated’ with policy.” Governmentality studies examine both hierarchical and horizontal forms of power relations which the orientation that nothing is static and nothing is outside the sphere of power relations.

Engagement with arts and artistic practices often aid poststructuralist scholars to investigate the contours of political life (Shapiro 2019). Artistic, aesthetic, discursive, lyrical, and playful post-positivist orientations contend with positivist assumptions about objectivity, neutrality and causality. More often than not, these approaches and perspectives challenge status quo norms and boundaries of what other scholars consider to be monolithic, universal, or standard norms in the discipline. There is no linear cause and effect to be precisely understood, coded, mapped, and pinned down. Rather, power travels – through media discourse, through everyday speech, and everyday habits – as such, transcending hierarchical modes of governance into networks, nodes, and horizontal forms of organization.

Poststructural analysis contends with hierarchical, linear, categorical modes of articulation and expression, and centers the use of interpretation, meaning, and metaphor to analyse political phenomena. These approaches become apparent through a range of methodologies and methods, including but not limited to interpretive analysis, community-engaged research, arts-based participatory action research, political ethnography, and critical discourse analysis. As Brazilian arts-educator Bruno De Oliveira Jayme explains with reference to arts-based community-engaged research, and follow-

ing from Deleuze and Guattari's use of the metaphor of a patchwork quilt to gather disjointed elements, mosaics and other forms of arts-based narrative creation serve to gather disjointed individual stories. Symbols selected by participants offer separate and unique elements, but they are not disparate as these same symbols are combined to form a whole, a collective message.

A practical example of this arts-based intervention is apparent in the community mosaic of bell hooks that Jayme co-created with participants from across Canada and globally, in response to a reflective prompt: "What does the horizon of community-engaged research look like to you?" His curation of this intervention involved extending an invitation to participants – no prior artistic experience required – to paint their visions on a square and contribute to a mosaic. This collection of images via mosaic, a single object formed by many hands, drawings, narratives and components, conveys numerous polyphonic messages about the meaning of community. Through the creative praxis of co-creation, participants challenged conventional positivist assumptions about how knowledge is to be formulated, understood, analysed, and explained. These forms of arts-creation efforts give expression to poststructural approaches to creative and critical political science by offering multivocal modes of expression that challenge hegemonic, top-down, forms of knowledge.

This approach also involves creating space for multiple voices and perspectives, an approach that can be understood as bringing polyphonic collaborations into research. As Patricia R. Zimmermann and Helen De Michiel (2018, 58) observe: "polyphony presents a useful theoretical construct to understand the shift from a single authorial vision to a multiplicity of voices that come together to create new understandings or subjects or events." Poststructural approaches to policy analysis adopt this polyphonic orientation to rearrange linear narratives and to emphasize instead a kaleidoscopic (re)presentation of voices and vantage points to more demo-

cratically investigate the pressing political challenges of our times.

SARAH MARIE WIEBE

References

- Bacchi, Carol and Goodwin, Susan. 2016. *Poststructural Policy Analysis: A Guide to Practice*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brady, Michelle. 2011. "Researching Governmentalities Through Ethnography: The Case of Australian Welfare Reforms and Programs for Single Parents." *Critical Policy Studies* 5, no. 3: 264–82.
- Durnová, Anna. 2022. "Making Interpretive Policy Analysis Critical and Societally Relevant: Emotions, Ethnography and Language." *Policy & Politics* 50, no. 1: 43–58.
- Foucault, Michel. 1994. "Governmentality." In *The Essential Foucault*, edited by P. Rabinow and N. Rose, 229–45. New York: New Press.
- Hobson, Kersty. 2013. "On the Making of the Environmental Citizen." *Environmental Politics* 22, no. 1: 56–72.
- Jayme, Bruno de Oliveira. 2016. *The heART of Social Movement and Learning*. PhD Dissertation. University of Victoria. See also: www.brunojayme.com/.
- McKee, Kim. 2009. "Post-Foucauldian Governmentality: What Does it Offer Critical Social Policy Analysis?" *Critical Social Policy* 29, no. 3: 465–86.
- Orsini, Michael and Miriam Smith, eds. 2007. *Critical Policy Studies*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Shapiro, Michael. 2019. *Punctuations: How Arts Think the Political*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Teghtsoonian, Katherine. 2009. "Depression and Mental Health in Neoliberal Times: A Critical Analysis of Policy and Discourse." *Social Science & Medicine*. 69, no. 1 (July): 28–35.
- Wiebe, Sarah Marie. 2023. *Life against States of Emergency: Revitalizing Treaty Relations from Attawapiskat*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Wiebe, Sarah Marie. 2017. *Everyday Exposure: Environmental Justice and Indigenous Mobilization in Canada's Chemical Valley*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Zimmermann, Patricia R. and Helen De Michiel. 2018. *Open Space New Media Documentary: A Toolkit for Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.

124. Poverty

Poverty is the condition of having insufficient resources to adequately meet basic needs. In the United States, poverty has often been explained as the result of individual failings or dysfunctional communities. In its most extreme form, Charles Murray links these arguments to explicitly racist claims about a “culture of poverty” in African-American communities and the unequal distribution of I.Q. among different races (Murray 2015; Herrnstein and Murray 1996). Yet, even the socialist Michael Harrington latched onto the “culture of poverty” trope (Harrington and Isserman 2012). Related to these tropes is what is sometimes called “the success sequence,” which suggests that poverty is avoidable if an individual simply stays in school, graduates, gets a job and keeps it, and gets married before having children. The success sequence is generally the approach adopted by conservatives as the best way to solve the problem of poverty (although it is a policy not restricted to people who identify as Republicans).

Alternatively, poverty can be understood as the unfortunate result of inadequate or failed policies and the consequence of an economic and political system that privileges the interests of corporations and wealthy individuals over those living more precarious lives. This understanding of poverty still tends to see it as an aberration of modern society, confined to a small minority of people and, therefore, a problem that can be remedied through political and policy action, such as social welfare, nutrition, and health care programs. This is generally the liberal approach to solving the problem of poverty.

However, a more critical perspective rejects these two explanations in favor of structural, systemic, and functional ones – that is, instead of describing poverty by the characteristics that most likely accompany it (i.e., one’s race, gender, marital status, education level, etc.), or viewing it as a product of insufficient policy intervention, we can seek to evaluate the systems that breed it and ask why those systems persist over time. This more radical understanding of poverty observes, first, that poverty in the United States is not anomalous, but common and widespread as documented by studies that measure the incidence of poverty over one’s

life span (Rank and Hirschl 2015). Second, critical approaches to poverty foreground the ways in which poverty serves economic, political, and social functions – it is *useful*.

Karl Marx argued that a suitably large population of desperate, immiserated people – what we have come to call a reserve army of labor – helps capitalists keep wages low and workers fearful, because there will always be someone more desperate to take their job (Marx 1867). Poverty is in this way a necessary component of the capitalist political economy, although we can see wide variation in how different capitalist states use their power to mitigate the effects of the market on human misery. Cedric Robinson’s notion of “racial capitalism” observes that capital accumulation also relies on exploitation by race (Robinson et al. 2019). It is therefore not mere coincidence that poverty rates (and other indicators of ill-being) are worse in people and communities of color.

Sociologist Herbert Gans outlined many uses or functions of poverty, including ensuring that there would be people desperate enough to perform the low-paid, dangerous “dirty work” needed to keep society functioning; to service the lifestyles of the wealthy (child care, domestic labor); to create jobs for social workers, charity leaders, police, and prisons; to sustain exploitative businesses (check cashing outlets, rent-to-own stores, lottery sales); and to guarantee superior status to those better off than them (Gans 1972; 1971). Historian Michael Katz demonstrates that throughout U.S. history, poor relief programs have been designed to provide limited relief as cheaply as practicable and to suppress dissatisfaction that can lead to political insurgency, while otherwise imposing discipline and compliance that regulates the labor market (Katz 1996). Frances Fox Piven and Richard A. Cloward emphasize the regulatory functions of poor relief programs, arguing that they expand in times of mass unrest to quiet the mob, and are then contracted after the disruption subsides in order to push recipients back into the low-wage labor market (Piven and Cloward 1993). In this respect, however, Piven and Cloward also see the potential political power poor people have to open fissures in the economic and political system and to expose the failures of relief policies that purport to offer aid, but

seldom do in proportion to the actual needs of recipients (Piven and Cloward 1966).

STEPHEN PIMPARE

References

- Gans, Herbert J. 1971. "The Uses of Poverty: The Poor Pay All." *Social Policy* July/August.
- Gans, Herbert. 1972. "The Positive Functions of Poverty." *American Journal of Sociology* 78 (2): 275–89.
- Harrington, Michael, and Maurice Isserman. 2012. *The Other America: Poverty in the United States*. New York: Scribner.
- Herrnstein, Richard J., and Charles Murray. 1996. *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*. New York: Free Press.
- Katz, Michael B. 1996. *In the Shadow of the Poorhouse: A Social History of Welfare in America*. 10th Anniversary Edition, Revised and Updated. New York: Basic Books.
- Marx, Karl. 1867. "Economic Manuscripts: Capital Vol. I - Chapter Twenty-Five." www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch25.htm.
- Murray, Charles A. 2015. *Losing Ground American Social Policy, 1950–1980*. New York: Basic Books.
- Piven, Frances Fox, and Richard A. Cloward. 1966. "The Weight of the Poor: A Strategy to End Poverty." *The Nation*, May 2, 1966. www.thenation.com/article/archive/weight-poor-strategy-end-poverty/.
- Piven, Frances Fox and Richard A. Cloward. 1993. *Regulating the Poor: The Functions of Public Welfare*, Updated Edition. New York: Vintage Books.
- Rank, Mark R., and Thomas A. Hirschl. 2015. "The Likelihood of Experiencing Relative Poverty over the Life Course." *PLOS ONE* 10, no. 7: e0133513.
- Robinson, Cedric J., H. L. T. Quan, Ruth Wilson Gilmore, and Elizabeth Peters Robinson. 2019. *Cedric J. Robinson: On Racial Capitalism, Black Internationalism, and Cultures of Resistance*. London: Pluto Press.
- See also
Richard A. Cloward; Frances Fox Piven; Michael Harrington; Sanford Schram

125. Proletariat

There are three eras of the proletariat. For the ancient world, the proletariat consisted of the urban landless poor, including not only wage laborers, but also lower artisans and traders. Between ancient times and modernity, the proletariat had an academic meaning for aristocratic scholars of the classics; and, in the nineteenth century, Socialists and Communists used the term to designate the emergent industrial working class. If there is a fourth era of the proletariat, it is characterized by its decline both as a term and as an historical social force.

In sixth century BC Rome, the term *proletarii* named the lowest class of the census. *Proletarii*, meaning “prolific people,” were named after the perception that their contribution to the state consisted of nothing but their progeny. Montesquieu and Rousseau used the term, borrowed directly from Cicero, only in their writings on ancient Rome, while Dr. Johnson’s Dictionary of 1756 defined the *Proletarian* as “vile; vulgar.”

Drawing on this noble vocabulary, the term “proletaire” was first used to give a name to the masses that emerged from historical obscurity during the French Revolution (Lovell 1988). Later, in the 1830s and 1840s, Jean Charles Leonard Sismondi, Auguste Blanqui, Lorenz von Stein, and other Socialists introduced the term “proletariat,” as distinct from the singular *proletaire*. The distinctiveness of this third era was confirmed in 1844, when Karl Marx and Frederick Engels used it to refer specifically to the wage laborers of the capitalist mode of production.

Engels wrote extensively about the proletariat in his study of the conditions of the working class in England when most commentators on the new class of industrial workers continued throughout the nineteenth century to refer only to the poor (Booth 1889–1903), the underworld (Mayhew 1862), the industrial residuum (Bosanquet 1898), the ragged (Hollingshead 1861), or the Rookeries (Beames 1852). The introduction of the term “proletariat” in 1843 marked a turning point in Marx’s writing, which had previously discussed the “poor.” It was also a turning point in the political theory of the proletariat itself.

Uniquely, Marx’s theory of the proletariat cast it as the agent of a world revolution, which would replace capitalism with

socialism. From the 1840s onwards, Marx and Engels based their politics on “the real, historical proletarian movement and its experience of class struggle” (Blackburn 1976, 33). Partly in response to political events, however, by 1850, Marx (2010) revised the simplified image of the revolutionary proletariat and rejected the Gotha Programme’s overstatement of the revolutionary potential of the proletariat and ridiculed the caricatured depiction of “all other classes [as] only one reactionary mass” (Marx 2023, 61).

The subsequent history of the proletariat and its discourses, prior to the development of a twentieth-century theory of class (Linebaugh and Rediker 2002), has been characterized by diminution, erosion, and decline. Since the middle of the twentieth-century, after the average income of the working class in the world’s leading economies more than doubled in a short period, the idea of the proletariat as without property seemed out of date. Subsequently, the concept of the proletariat has been replaced by categories such as the “affluent worker” (Goldthorpe, Lockwood et al. 1968) even though the phrase “The proletarian is without property” (Marx and Engels 2015, 244) was not intended to refer to workers lacking “washing-machines, television and the rest” (Hoggart 1960, 29). As Engels clarified in a footnote in 1888, the concept of the proletariat as a propertyless class referred to them “having no means of production of their own [and therefore being] reduced to selling their labour power in order to live” (Przeworski 1985, 57).

Smaller classes other than the traditional “big classes” of upper class, middle class, and working class or proletariat are regarded by social scientists as more realistic. This intellectual tendency reaches its limit point in the study of microclasses (Grusky and Sørensen 2001) that correspond to the actual differential field of “fine-grained occupational categories” (Wright 2015, x). Sociologists and other experts argue that the proletariat has been disappearing for decades. A recent study says that less than 15 percent of the U.K. population are “traditional working class” or proletariat (Savage 2015). However, if we understand the proletariat as “having no means of production” and thereby add the new categories of “working poor,” “affluent workers,” and “precariat” to the “traditional working class” then the same study can be reinterpreted as demon-

strating that over 50 percent of the U.K. is working class. Neoliberals in the 1990s said that the traditional working class had vanished since the “aspirational working class” had become middle class, leaving behind the “rump” of the underclass relying on state handouts (Jones 2011). In a parallel development, the Wages for Housework movement said “Waged men ... occupied a position of oppression of women.”

It is possible to detect a normative decline of the proletariat from subculture (Hebdige 1979) to underclass (Wacquant 2022) and the chav (Tyler 2013) in which the working class has descended from the agent of “symbolic resistance” (Hall and Jefferson 1975) to being demonized and stigmatized as well as being blamed for the rise of Donald Trump in the United States and Brexit in the United Kingdom. Today, the proletarian politics of class has been eclipsed by a middle-class politics of work focused on the cognitariat (Berardi 2013), the precariat (Standing 2011), and the projectariat (Szreder 2021). Here, the proletariat is subsumed under a politics of the degradation of middle-class work, which emphasizes the gig economy not casualization, the networked 24/7 worker not the shift worker and “Bullshit jobs” not “shit jobs” (Graeber 2018). As a result of the weakening of the workers movement and the rise of right-wing populism, the politics of class has migrated from the proletariat to the underclass or the lumpenproletariat (Barrow 2020) and an emphasis on the middle class, especially the Professional Managerial Class (Ehrenreich 1977).

Analysis of the data shows that “most of the story about the ‘white working class’ is untrue or, at best ambiguous” (Bray 2017). Also, the traditional workerist image of the proletariat as white and male is being challenged by reconceptualizing workers as black, brown, yellow, female, Oriental, Asian, African, and South American. This is one of the major tasks of a twenty-first-century theory of class (Linebaugh and Rediker 2002).

DAVE BEECH

References

- Beames, Thomas. 1852. *The Rookeries of London*. London: Thomas Bosworth.
- Barrow, Clyde. 2020. *The Dangerous Class: The Concept of the Lumpenproletariat*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Berardi, Franco. 2013. “What does Cognitariat Mean?: Work Desire and Depression.” *Cultural Studies Review* 11, no. 2: 57–63.
- Blackburn, Robin. 1976. “Marxism: Theory of Proletarian Revolution.” *New Left Review* 97 (June): 3–35.
- Booth, Charles. 1889–1903. *Life and Labour of the People in London*, 17 vols. London: Macmillan.
- Bosanquet, Helen. 1998. *The Standard of Life and Other Studies*. London and New York: Macmillan.
- Bray, Michael. 2017. “The ‘White Working Class’ Does Not Exist: Thinking Through Liberal Postracialism.” Published online 20 September 2017. www.historicalmaterialism.org/blog/white-working-class-does-not-exist-thinking-through-liberal-postracialism. Accessed 30 March 2023.
- Ehrenreich, Barbara and John Ehrenreich. 1977. “The Professional-Managerial Class.” *Radical America* 11, no. 2: 7–31.
- Goldthorpe, J.H., D. Lockwood, F. Bechhofer, and J. Platt. 1968. *The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes and Behaviour*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Graeber, David. 2018. *Bullshit Jobs: A Theory*. London: Allen Lane.
- Grusky, David and Jesper B. Sørensen. 2001. “Are There Big Social Classes.” In *Social Stratification: Class, Race, and Gender in Sociological Perspective*, edited by David Grusky, 183–94. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Hall, Stuart and Tony Jefferson, eds. 1975. *Resistance Through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-war Britain*. London: Verso.
- Hebdige, Dick. 1979. *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*. London: Routledge.
- Hoggart, Richard. 1960. “Working Class Attitudes.” *New Left Review* 1 (January/February): 26–30.
- Hollingshead, John. 1861. *Ragged London in 1861*. London: Smith, Elder and Co.
- Jones, Owen. 2011. *Chavs: The Demonization of the Working Class*. London: Verso.
- Linebaugh, Peter and Marcus Rediker. 2002. *The Many-Headed Hydra: The Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic*. London: Verso.
- Lovell, David. 1988. *Marx’s Proletariat: The Making of a Myth*. London: Routledge.
- Marx, Karl. 2010. *The Revolutions of 1848*. London: Verso.
- Marx, Karl. 2023. *Critique of the Gotha Program*, translated by Kevin B. Anderson and Karel Ludenhoff. Oakland: PM Press.
- Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. 2015. “Manifesto of the Communist Party.” In *The Cambridge Companion to The Communist Manifesto*, edited by Terrell Carver and James Farr, 237–260. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Mayhew, Henry. 1862. *London Labour and the London Poor*. London: Griffin, Bohn and Co.
- Przeworski, Adam. 1985. *Capitalism and Social Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Savage, Mike. 2015. *Social Class in the 21st Century*. London: Pelican.
- Standing, Guy. 2011. *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Szreder, Kuba. 2021. *The ABC of the Projectariat: Living and Working in a Precarious Art World*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Tyler, Imogen. 2013. *Revolting Subjects: Social Abjection and Resistance in Neoliberal Britain*. London: Zed Books.
- Wacquant, Loïc. 2022. *The Invention of the 'Underclass': A Study of the Politics of Knowledge*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Wright, Erik Olin. 2015. *Understanding Class*. London: Verso.

See also

Class; Lumpenproletariat; Petit Bourgeois; Exploitation; Surplus Value

126. Racialization

The concept of *racialization* was first used in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, where it was adopted in political anthropology to mean “a physical process” of race building and the loss of racial qualities through increasing racial mixture (Barot and Bird 2001). The post-World War II political need to disavow and de-centre biological race, amidst the discrediting of scientific racism, accounts for the emergence of racialization as a *critical* concept in academic studies of racism.

The critical move in social sciences is credited to the sociologist Michael Banton, who utilized the concept of racialization to describe a process whereby “a mode of categorization was developed, applied tentatively in European historical writing and then, more confidently to the populations of the world” (Banton 1977, 18–19). Robert Miles advanced and further developed the concept of racialization to describe the process of racial categorization in the context of the development of capitalism and colonialism, as “those instances where social relations between people have been structured by the signification of human biological characteristics ... to define and construct differentiated social collectivities,” entailing “a process of categorisation, a representational process of defining an Other (usually, but not exclusively) somatically” (Miles 1989, 75). Miles argued that the academic use of “race” as a concept reproduces racism as an ideology and should be avoided in favour of racialization as a component of racism.

The political need to contest the ideological reproduction of race as biology paralleled the need to recognise the salience of progressive race-conscious struggles against racism. This *dual-demand* contended with the continued use of “race” in public and political discourse and institutionalized practices which reproduce the idea of racialized *hierarchies* of biological superiority/inferiority. Responses to this dual demand are reflected in the rejection of “race” as a biological fact, while acknowledging the salience of race as social fact (contra Miles) in racism research (Modood et al. 2002). Additionally, *discursive de-racialization* responds to the omission of explicit references to “race” in discourses which are nevertheless racist,

while *anti-racialization* recognises anti-racist resistances that subvert the negative meanings of race (Reeves 1983). However, a consequence of these conceptual developments is that it is “not always clear what the race in racialization refers to” (Murji and Solomos 2005, 4).

The dual-demand has led to racialization being used differently, for example in the United States and in Britain. In the United States, due to the historical legacy of African enslavement, Reconstruction, Jim Crow, and political mobilisations (Civil Rights and Black Power) against racism, racialization scholarship has focused on black-white race-relations. This dynamic is captured in Omi and Winant’s (1994) highly influential concept of racial formation, which defines racialization as an integral ideological process where shifting meanings of race are produced by racially formed groups in struggle. Extending racialization to Latino/a and East Asians, beyond the black-white binary, without displacing the historical import of anti-Black racism is contingent on acknowledging the temporal and spatial particularities of race (Gonzalez-Sobrinio and Goss 2019). In the British context, the use of racialization is reflective of mobilisations against racism, which are historically grounded in post-war migrations to Britain from its colonial territories in Africa, the Caribbean, post-partition India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh. Initial scholarship focused on immigration controls as a central locus through which the British state racialized Britishness. Anti-racist resistance, particularly against domestic policing in the 1970s (Hall et al. 1978) curated prominent critiques of the idea that racialization should displace the use of “race” as social fact. Paul Gilroy (1987) contends that Miles’ critique ignores the cultural salience of race, thus silencing its use in political mobilisations against racism. Centering ethnicity has been influential in approaches to culture as a homologue of race (Malik 1996), particularly in the construction of religio-culturally signified racialized groups, such as Muslim and Jewish communities (Meer 2013).

While the utility of racialization has been questioned (Barot and Bird 2001), scholars continue to argue for its usage (Meer 2013; Gonzalez-Sobrinio and Goss 2019). Adam Hochman (2019) has offered the most recent defense against realist conceptions of “race as social fact” to define racialization “as the

process through which groups come to be understood as major biological entities and human lineages, formed due to reproductive isolation, in which membership is transmitted through biological descent" (2019, 1246). In this formulation racialization produces racialized *not* racial groups. Hochman's interactive constructionist approach has itself been criticized by Deniz Uyan (2021) who argues that the definition "unknowingly countersigns a uniquely American ideological conception of race" (Uyan 2021, 15; see Hochman 2021 for a reply to Uyan).

CHRISTOPHER KYRIAKIDES AND BEATRICE
ANANE-BEDIAKOH

References

- Banton, Michael. 1977. *The Idea of Race*. London: Tavistock.
- Barot, Rohit, and John Bird. 2001. "Racialization: The Genealogy and Critique of a Concept." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24, no. 4: 601–18.
- Gilroy, Paul. 1987. *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack: The Cultural Politics of Race and Nation*. London: Hutchinson.
- Gonzalez-Sobrinio, Bianca, and Devon R. Goss. 2019. "Exploring the Mechanisms of Racialization Beyond the Black–White Binary." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 42, no. 4: 505–10.
- Hall, Stuart, Charles Critcher, Tony Jefferson, John Clarke and Brian Roberts. 1978. *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State, and Law and Order*. London: Macmillan.
- Hochman, Adam. 2019. "Racialization: A Defense of the Concept." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 42, no. 8: 1245–62.
- Hochman, Adam. 2021. "Further Defense of the Racialization Concept: A Reply to Uyan." *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race* 18, no. 1: 31–48.
- Malik, Kenan. 1996. *The Meaning of Race: Race, History and Culture in Western Society*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Meer, Nasar. 2013. "Racialization and Religion: Race, Culture and Difference in the Study of Antisemitism and Islamophobia." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36, no. 3: 385–98.
- Miles, Robert. 1989. *Racism*. London: Routledge.
- Modood, Tariq, Richard Berthoud, and James Nazroo. 2002. "Race, Racism and Ethnicity: A Response to Ken Smith." *Sociology* 36, no. 2: 419–27.
- Murji, Karim, and John Solomos, eds. 2005. *Racialization: Studies in Theory and Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. 1986. *Racial Formation in the United States*, 1st edn. New York: Routledge.
- Reeves, Frank. 1983. *British Racial Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Uyan, Deniz. 2021. "Re-Thinking Racialization: The Analytical Limits of Racialization." *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race* 18, no. 1: 15–29.

127. Reification

Reification is a theoretical concept developed within the Western Marxist tradition of political theory. The mainstream definition of the term refers simultaneously to the objectification or concretization of something abstract, while the fallacy of reification refers to falsely treating an idea or abstraction as something real. For Marxists, reification refers to how the logic of exchange value reduces social relations to relations between objects, and how certain commodities acquire a magnetic or revered status akin to a religious fetish. In critical political science, reification is productive for theorizing the socially and psychologically alienating effects of capitalism, as well as the limitations of mainstream theoretical concepts. Reification describes how one becomes an object as “worker,” rather than an individual human subject in the process of exchanging labor for wages. While there is not a specific “canonical source” for the concept of reification, the term came into prominence with Georg Lukács’s 1923 essay “Reification and the Consciousness of the Proletariat” (Rose 2014 [1978], 36). This essay had enormous influence on the Critical Theorists of the Frankfurt School, but beyond critical theory reification has been used more recently to criticize the concretization of norms and concepts in international relations.

With his theory of reification, Georg Lukács (1975 [1923]) earned the legendary status of prefiguring Karl Marx’s theory of alienation in the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, a text that was published nearly ten years after Lukács published *History and Class Consciousness*. Lukács developed his theory of reification by drawing on Marx’s theory of commodity fetishism, which is developed in *Capital, Volume One* (Marx 1978 [1867]). Marx (1978 [1867], 320) notes that the “mystical” character of commodities emerges when they are exchanged in the process of accumulating surplus value. Exchange value creates the possibility for unlike objects to be made equal in terms of their value on the market, which obscures the use-value and socially necessary labor required to make the object. Commodities are “mysterious” because they appear to be independent of the labor required for their production and acquire a life and value of their own akin to a religious fetish.

Labor is thus divorced from the products it creates, and it too becomes a commodity. In the process of commodity exchange, relations between humans become relations between things: “labor power is [the worker’s] only possession,” and their labor is valued solely for how it can increase the accumulation of value for the capitalist class (Lukács 1975, 92). A commodity masks the social relations required to make each product and reduces social relations to an object of calculable value.

Lukács (1975, 92) builds on Marx’s concept of commodity fetishism by arguing that the logic of commodity exchange reduces human relations to relations between objects and elevates the status of commodities to the universal organizing principle of society. This objectification of social relations is not readily visible as it is accepted as convention or “second nature.” Workers tolerate their objecthood because they need to work to survive, but meanwhile commodity exchange defines social relations and workers internalize a reified form of consciousness. By rendering humans intellectually passive, reification alters the human capacity for active and deep cognition, and thus “what is at stake in the struggle for socialism is not only a change in society, but also the fate of rationality” (Feenberg 2014, 61).

Lukács’s theory of reification was influential with many scholars in the Frankfurt School of Critical Theory, and many subsequent scholars credit his work with beginning the tradition of Western Marxism (Feenberg 2017; Jay 1984; Rose 2014; Stahl 2018). As Feenberg (2014) notes, Lukács was concerned with the crisis of reason stemming from capitalist rationality. This influenced Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer when they critiqued instrumental reason in *The Dialectic of Enlightenment* (2002 [1947]). While Lukács was influential to the Frankfurt School, Adorno was critical of Lukács’s idealism, because he thought that Lukács erroneously privileged the proletariat as the “subject/object of history” and viewed reification as a “fact of consciousness” (Rose 2014, 52, 56). Adorno (1973) emphasized how the reductive logic of exchange value permeates all aspects of contemporary life, which leads to reified thinking and reified concepts. Concepts may appear to describe reality, or a given object, but in doing so they miss aspects of the object that are beyond conceptualization. Objects

always include a non-identical remainder that resists conceptual capture (Adorno 1973). For Adorno, reified thinking erroneously aims to identify concepts with objects, or to ascribe an equal value to dissimilar objects (Adorno 1973; Rose 2014).

More recently, Axel Honneth (2008) has theorized reification alongside recognition. Honneth forgoes Lukács's dialectical method in favor of an anthropological approach that views reification as a product of socialization (Honneth 2008; Kavoulakos 2017). For Honneth, reification is an absence of recognition – or seeing another as a subject. Contrary to Lukács, Honneth views reification as a habit rather than a psychological condition. Recognition is the remedy to the objectification entailed by reification or other forms of social exclusion (Honneth 2008, Kavoulakos 2017).

Beyond critical theory, the concept of reification has gained resonance in international relations, as a concept for criticizing jargon that loses touch with reality when it becomes fixed in the literature (Barder and Levine 2012; Brown 2020; Kaczmarek 2019; Winkler 2019). Kaczmarek (2019) uses “international society” as an example of how conceptual reification in international relations can mask power and individual agency. Likewise, Winkler (2014, 484) uses reification to examine how Japanese “soft power” has become “imbued with different meanings” and is no longer isolated to the sphere of diplomacy in Japanese politics. Brown (2020) uses reification to describe how treating categories as concrete entities can erase the socio-political and historical backgrounds of commonly deployed concepts, for example, states or human nature. These scholars demonstrate how reification is productive for criticizing concepts and categories that have become frozen into academic jargon. Furthermore, this research implores political science scholars to be more attentive to how rigid classificatory systems can occlude political reality, social difference, and alternative ways of understanding political realities. The theory of reification is thus a generative line of inquiry for questioning the certainty implicit in static concepts and stale academic jargon.

MARY E. WITLACIL

References

- Adorno, Theodor. 1973. *Negative Dialectics*, translated by E. Ashton. New York: Seabury Press.
- Barder, Alexander D. and Daniel J. Levine. 2012. “‘The World Is Too Much with Us’: Reification and the Depoliticising of *Via Media* Constructivist IR.” *Millennium Journal of International Studies* 40, no. 3: 585–604.
- Brown, M. Anne. 2020. “The Spatial Turn, Reification and Relational Epistemologies in ‘Knowing About’ Security and Peace.” *Cooperation and Conflict* 55, no. 3: 421–41.
- Feenberg, Andrew. 2014. *The Philosophy of Praxis: Marx, Lukács and the Frankfurt School*. New York & London: Verso Books.
- Feenberg, Andrew. 2017. “Why Students of the Frankfurt School Will Have to Read Lukács.” In *The Palgrave Handbook of Critical Theory*, edited Michael J. Thomson, 109–23. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fisher, Mark. 2020. *Postcapitalist Desire: The Final Lectures*, edited by Matt Colquhoun. London: Repeater Books.
- Honneth, Axel. 2008. *Reification: A New Look at an Old Idea*, translated by Joseph Ganahl. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Horkheimer, Max, and Theodor Adorno. 2002. *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*, translated by E. Jephcott. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Jay, Martin. 1984. *Marxism and Totality: The Adventures of a Concept from Lukács to Habermas*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Kaczmarek, Katarzyna. 2019. “Reification in IR: The Process and Consequences of Reifying The Idea of International Society.” *International Studies Review* 21: 347–72.
- Kavoulakos, Konstantinos. 2017. “Lukács’ Theory of Reification and the Tradition of Critical Theory.” In *The Palgrave Handbook of Critical Theory*, edited by Michael J. Thomson, 67–85. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lukács, Georg. 1968. *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*, Translated by Rodney Livingstone. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Marx, Karl. 1990. *Capital: Volume 1: A Critique of Political Economy*, translated by Ben Fowkes. London: Penguin.
- Marx, Karl. 1978. “Capital, Volume One.” In *The Marx-Engels Reader, Second Edition*, edited by Robert C. Tucker. New York, London: W.W. Norton.
- Rose, Gillian. 2014 [1978]. *The Melancholy Science: An Introduction to the Thought of Theodor W. Adorno*. New York & London: Verso Books.
- Stahl, Titus. 2018. “Georg [György] Lukács.” In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of*

Philosophy (Spring 2018 Edition), edited by: Edward N. Zalta. Accessed July 18, 2022, <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2018/entries/lukacs/>.

Tucker, Robert C., ed. 1978. *The Marx-Engels Reader, Second Edition*. New York, London. W.W. Norton.

Winkler, Stephanie Christine. 2019. “‘Soft Power is Such a Benign Animal’: Narrative Power and the Reification of Concepts in Japan.” *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 32, no. 4: 483–501.

Further readings

Habermas, Jürgen. 1984. *The Theory of Communicative Action: Volume 1: Reason and*

the Rationalization of Society, translated by: Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press.

Horkheimer, Max. 2013 [1947]. *Eclipse of Reason*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic Publishing.

Marcuse, Herbert. 1991 [1964]. *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*, 2nd edn. Boston: Beacon Press.

See also

Marxism; Alienation; Commodity Fetishism; Objectification

128. Ruling class

The term “ruling class” ranks among the essential and yet thoroughly contested concepts in critical political science. This partly stems from Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels’ tendency to deploy it when referring to groups exerting dominance over social relations of production, link it with the role played by the rulers in government and society at large, and then without warning, revise the criteria for determining the membership of this class. Apart from the dualistic class model in *The Communist Manifesto*, where the bourgeoisie enters the historical conflict with an expanding proletariat (Marx and Engels 1976 [1848], 482), elsewhere Marx (1979 [1853], 218) refers to the British ruling class as composed of “aristocracy,” “money-ocracy,” and “millocracy.” In the writings on the 1848–51 revolutionary ruptures in France, the ruling class divides into commercial and industrial “factions” and political wings, namely republican, Legitimist, Orleanist, and Bonapartist bourgeoisie (Marx 1979 [1852]). The intelligentsia (writers, politicians, journalists) are regarded as a distinct faction of the ruling class, mirroring the references to “ideological groups” in *Capital* (1990 [1867], 574) and “thinkers of the [ruling] class” in *The German Ideology* (1975 [1846], 60). In *The Civil War in France* (1986 [1871], 329), the term is used interchangeably with “ruling faction.” Throughout Marx and Engels’ corpus the term “ruling class” thus emerges as an ambiguous synonym for a ruling “group,” “faction” and “layer” all at the same time. The portmanteau nature of the concept has invited ideologically motivated criticisms by elitist and pluralist theories (Mosca 1939; Truman 1971 [1951]; Blaisdell 1957). In turn, students of Marx identified several points of contention surrounding the notion and attempted to resolve them creatively.

One area of discussion addresses the applicability of the term “ruling class” to the bourgeoisie. This consideration arises from the “historical specificity” of capitalism – the “complete separation” of private appropriation of surplus (the economic) from the performance of public duties (the political) (Wood 1995, 28–31). The bourgeoisie is a “dominant class” because compared to slaveholders, feudal lords, or state administrators it does not govern directly. Indeed, the divide

between the “ruling class” and “subjected classes” only applies to Western European feudalism and a select few instances of commercial patriciates of cities such as Venice, where commercial capitalists exercised direct rule (Bottomore 1993, 19). Moreover, the adjective “dominant” is defended because the bourgeoisie does not have to exclude other classes from the political process, insofar as its rule allows for a “democratic political life for all citizens.” Whether universal suffrage can augment the gradual erosion of class rule is debatable, but for Stojanović (1981, 163) this codicil allows distinguishing between dictatorial and democratic forms of capitalism without opting for a consensual and “de-classed” conceptualization of bourgeois democracy.

Marxist scholarship has also evaluated the degree to which a ruling class can be said to exert dominance (economic, political, ideological) both in comparison to other classes and in relation to itself. According to Miliband (1969, 23) the ruling class under capitalism is that class which owns and controls the means of production and uses the state as its instrument for the domination of society. This rule is evinced in its members’ control of the state through interlocking positions in the governmental, administrative, coercive, and ideological apparatuses. Critics of instrumentalism maintain that the direct participation of capitalists in the state apparatus is at best an auxiliary aspect of analysis (on the state debate, see Clarke 1991; Barrow 1993). For Poulantzas (1973), the departure from instrumentalism requires the redefinition of the ruling class with reference to the ownership of the means of production *plus* political and ideological relations. It warrants the focus on “social formation,” which involves more than one mode of production and thus multiple classes. In this interpretation, the “exploiting class” under capitalism is divided into fractions of industrial, commercial, financial capital (defined at the economic level), “comprador,” “national,” and “internal” bourgeoisie, and social categories such as “administrative bureaucracy” (ideological-political level). The broader notion of the “exploiting class” is contrasted with the “dominant class.” The latter refers to an alliance or “power bloc,” similar but distinct from Gramsci’s (1971, 366; 181–2) “historical bloc,” in which several classes or fractions are all dominant but one hegemonic

fraction unifies the bloc under its leadership. This pluralist conceptualization has been criticized for downplaying production relations, attributing conflict primarily to the arena of politics (disarticulated from the economy), synonymizing social classes and fractions with interest groups, and underestimating the agency of labor (Clarke 1978; Mouzelis 1978; Wood 1998; Wright 1979).

The concept of the “ruling class” stimulates the reflection on the position of political administrators in facilitating its rule. The participation of state managers and politicians in the reproduction of capitalism is undeniable but to what extent can their inclusion under the rubrics of the bourgeoisie and ruling class be justified, particularly if they are not individual owners of capital? Is the state under capitalism autonomous from direct ruling-class control? Responding to the first query, Draper (1978) and Anderson (1992) advocated an expanded definition of the bourgeoisie. It has been argued that the pure circle of capitalist proper (owners of means of production) is always too narrow to act alone as a class force. Therefore, insofar as the rule of capital necessitates the seizure of political power, it requires a *mass de manoeuvre* in some measure exterior to capital. This mass tends to be composed of “the gamut of professional, administrative, and technical groups that enjoy life conditions analogous to capitalist proper” (Anderson 1992, 112) but also possess a broader view of society. As for the second, the relationship between capitalists and state managers has been theorized by questioning the applicability of Althusserian “relative autonomy” thesis and rejecting the idea of a “class conscious” ruling class in favor of scrutinizing structural relationships between state managers and capitalists (Block 1981). Davidson (2012, 30–33) emphasizes congruent interests between capitalists and state managers (politicians and civil servants) originating from their common class position as members of the bourgeoisie. Not only are the state managers’ incomes paid from state revenues (the total surplus value), but their high levels of remuneration, security and prestige depend on the exploitation of wage-labor. Moreover, state officials are drawn into mutual relationships with capitalists because individual capitals provide them with resources through taxation and loans to attend to the needs of capital in general. Individual capitalists, meanwhile,

depend on state managers for sector-specific policy measures. The synonymization of state managers and bureaucracy with the “ruling class” has informed the interpretations of the Soviet Union as a capitalist (rather than socialist) mode of production notwithstanding the absence of private capitalists (Harman 1983; Callinicos 1991; Dunayevskaya 2017).

The onset of neoliberal globalization has engendered discussions about the emergence of the “transnational capitalist class” (TCC). For Sklair (2001) and Robinson (2004; 2014) circa the 1970s, social relations of production are less and gradually no longer embedded in spatially differentiated economic locales or nationally articulated class antagonisms. The emergence of the TCC is predicated upon the transnationalization of the productive capital’s circuit, involving both the spread of activities undertaken by transnational corporations and the restructuring, fragmentation and worldwide decentralization of the production process (Robinson 2004, 46–7). What renders the TCC into a “class-for-itself” is its control over emergent “transnational state apparatus,” conceptualized as a web of “de-centered institutions.” The TCC operates institutionally through this network (with the US state at its midpoint) to coordinate policies and practices across borders favoring the interests of transnational capital (Robinson 2014, 83). Skeptics (Anievas 2008; Embong 2000; Macartney 2009) asked whether transnational capital can be conceived as a monolithic bloc standing against the whims of decaying “national capital.” Such dualism would disregard potential conflicts between transnationally oriented functional fractions (money, productive, commodity) of capital. Moreover, due to its subjective conceptualization of class agency, the TCC thesis has tended to ignore the territorializing logic of capital accumulation, disregard structural determinants of class conflict, and misconstrue the role of states in promoting globalization. The lack of monopolization of the legitimate means of violence at the global level coupled with an absence of class-conscious transnational proletariat present additional problems. While the polymorphous crises of capitalism prompt us to reconsider extant critical frameworks and their capacity to shape emancipatory imaginaries, the pronouncements about the rise of a “global ruling class” detached from

nationally oriented circuits of capital seem to be premature.

JOKUBAS SALYGA

References

- Anderson, Perry. 1992. *English Questions*. London: Verso.
- Anievas, Alex. 2008. "Theory of the Global State: Globality as an Unfinished Revolution A Theory of Global Capitalism: Production, Class, and the State in a Transnational World." *Historical Materialism* 16, no. 2 (January): 190–206.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 1993. *Critical Theories of the State: Marxist, Neo-Marxist, Post-Marxist*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Blaisdell, Donald C. 1957. *American Democracy Under Pressure*. New York: The Ronald Press Company.
- Block, Fred. 1981. "Beyond Relative Autonomy: State Managers as Historical Subjects." In *Socialist Register 1980*, Vol. 17, edited by Ralph Miliband and John Saville, 227–41.
- Bottomore, Tom. 1993. *Elites and Society*, 2nd Edition. London: Routledge.
- Callinicos, Alex. 1991. *The Revenge of History: Marxism and the East European Revolutions*. London: Polity.
- Clarke, Simon. 1978. "Capital, Fractions of Capital and the State: 'Neo-Marxist' Analysis of the South African State." *Capital & Class* 2, no. 2 (June): 32–77.
- Clarke, Simon. 1991. *The State Debate*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Davidson, Neil. 2012. "The Necessity of Multiple Nation-States for Capital." *Rethinking Marxism* 24, no. 1 (January) 26–46.
- Draper, Hal. 1978. *Karl Marx's Theory of Revolution Vol. II: The Politics of Social Classes*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Dunayevskaya, Raya. 2017. *Russia: From Proletarian Revolution to State-Capitalist Counter-Revolution: Selected Writings*. Leiden: Brill.
- Embong, Abdul, R. 2000. "Globalization and Transnational Class Relations: Some Problems of Conceptualization." *Third World Quarterly* 21, no. 6 (December): 989–1000.
- Harman, Chris. 1983. *Class Struggles in Eastern Europe, 1945–83*. London: Pluto.
- Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, edited and translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith. New York: International Publishers.
- Macartney, Huw. 2009. "Variegated Neo-Liberalism: Transnationally Oriented Fractions of Capital in EU Financial Market Integration." *Review of International Studies* 35, no. 2 (April): 451–80.
- Marx, Karl. 1979 [1852]. "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte." In *Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels Collected Works*, Volume 11, 99–197. Moscow: International Publishers.
- Marx, Karl. 1979 [1853]. "The Future Results of British Rule in India." In *Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels Collected Works*, Volume 12, 217–22. Moscow: International Publishers.
- Marx, Karl. 1990 [1867]. *Capital Volume 1: A Critique of Political Economy*. Penguin: London.
- Marx, Karl. 1986 [1871]. "The Civil War in France." In *Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels Collected Works*, Volume 22, 307–59. Moscow: International Publishers.
- Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. 1975 [1846]. "The German Ideology." In *Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels Collected Works*, Volume 5, 19–584. Moscow: International Publishers.
- Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. 1976 [1848]. "Manifesto of the Communist Party." In *Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels Collected Works*, Volume 6, 477–519. Moscow: International Publishers.
- Miliband, Ralph. 1969. *The State in Capitalist Society*. New York: Basic Books.
- Mosca, Gaetano. 1939. *The Ruling Class*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Mouzelis, Nicos, P. 1978. *Modern Greece: Facets of Underdevelopment*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. 1973. "On Social Classes." *New Left Review* I, no. 78 (March): 27–54.
- Robinson, William, I. 2004. *A Theory of Global Capitalism: Production, Class, and State in a Transnational World*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Robinson, William, I. 2014. *Global Capitalism and the Crisis of Humanity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sklair, Leslie. 2001. *The Transnational Capitalist Class*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Stojanović, Svetozar. 1981. "Marxism and Democracy: The Ruling Class or the Dominant Class?" *Praxis International* 1 no. 2 (January): 160–70.
- Truman, David, B. 1951. *The Governmental Process: Political Interests and Public Opinion*. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Wood, Ellen, M. 1995. *Democracy Against Capitalism: Renewing Historical Materialism*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Wood, Ellen, M. 1998. *The Retreat from Class: A New 'True' Socialism*. London: Verso.
- Wright, Erik, O. 1979. *Class, Crisis, and the State*. London: Verso.

See also

Marxism; Theories of the State; Capitalist Class; Hegemony

129. Socialism

Socialism is an essentially contested concept (Gallie 1955–56; Gray 1977) without a universally agreed upon definition, and the contestation over its meaning has been a major aspect of left-wing politics around the world for the better part of the past two hundred years. While socialism is an essentially contested concept, and it is often deployed outside of critical political science as a pejorative term, socialism is best understood as an umbrella category, which includes a variety of distinct traditions. The dominant and most influential tradition in academia and the practice of radical politics is the Marxist tradition established by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels in the nineteenth century.

While Marxism is often identified with the “Communist” tradition, for Marx and many critical political scientists still today, Marxism is first and foremost a socialist theoretical and political tradition that differs significantly from the political systems that call themselves “Communist” or that are otherwise associated with “Communism” by both supporters and detractors of those systems. There is a wide range of terminology used to capture the difference between the theory of socialism put forward by Marx and Engels and the supposed attempts at implementing that vision. In other words, different labels are used to capture the difference between Karl Marx’s radically democratic theory of socialism and the twentieth- and twenty-first-century governments that describe themselves as socialist/Communist, such as the USSR, China, Cuba, and Venezuela. These labels, however problematic, include terms such as “state capitalism,” “state socialism,” “deformed or degenerated workers’ states,” “really or actually existing socialism,” and “real socialism.” Michael Leibowitz (2006; 2012), among others, has used the latter label along with “twenty-first-century socialism” to describe the radical potential of Venezuela under Hugo Chavez in particular.

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels did not simply describe their preferred version of socialism, but they were also the foremost analysts and critics of the non-Marxist forms of socialist politics that existed in the nineteenth century and earlier. In the *Communist Manifesto* (1978), for example, Marx and Engels have distinct conceptions and criti-

cisms of “reactionary socialism,” “conservative, or bourgeois, socialism,” and “critical utopian socialism” – all of which fail to meet the revolutionary, historical materialist conception of socialism defended by Marx and Engels (1978). In *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, Engels (1978) further elaborates the different forms of socialism, including the “scientific” socialism that he and Marx articulated in *The Communist Manifesto*.

There are also a variety of non-Marxist socialist traditions, such as utopian socialism (Fourier 1971), Christian socialism (Kaufmann 1888), Arab socialism (Salama 1972), eco-socialism (Saito 2017), socialist feminism (Holmstrom 2002), and the trans-ideological variants of anarcho-socialism (Proudhon 2004). However, all of these socialist traditions combined are still less prevalent than the Marxist variant in critical political science. Notwithstanding the dominance of the Marxian conception of socialism, or rather the broader methodological influence of Marxist dialectics, most critical political science would probably best be categorized as a kind of reformist socialism in the vein of Eduard Bernstein (1993).

For critical political scientists, socialism can refer to (1) the goal or (2) the movement towards the goal of a radically democratic, egalitarian, ecological, post-capitalist society. However, critical political scientists often use the term socialism without clearly conceptualizing it and without clearly distinguishing it from a progressive welfare state within a capitalist political economy that remains anchored in commodity production, private property, and wage labor – as opposed to a socialist political economy that is inclusive, participatory, ecologically just, and provides fairly for the needs (and perhaps some wants) of most people equitably.

In its best and most coherent articulation, socialism is a political-economic system where workers, and the whole society, control the major decision-making processes about production, distribution, and consumption in way that is inclusive and ecologically sensitive. Furthermore, socialism implies the eradication of exploitative wage labor and the production of commodities as the primary purpose of production – all within democratic institutions that ensure people are empowered to challenge political exclusion and injustice.

It is not uncommon for progressive liberal politics and social democracy/ies to be described as “socialist” or “democratic socialist.” This is especially true since Occupy Wall Street and the two Bernie Sanders campaigns (to say nothing for the ascendancy of Jeremy Corbyn to the top of the UK Labour Party and the differential “successes” of Podemos in Spain and SYRIZA in Greece). In terms of achieving socialism, there are reformist socialists, such as Bernstein and to a certain degree, Karl Kautsky (1910), as well as more revolutionary socialists working in the traditions of Marx and Engels, and for the more anarchistically inclined, Mikhail Bakunin (1972) and Emma Goldman (1969). More popular political writing found in places like *Jacobin*, *Dissent*, and *New Politics* (each often feature critical political scientists) tend towards a radically-reformist politics that aims at systemic transformation over a longer period and with as little violence as possible or no violence at all, often giving pride of place to electoral politics and civil disobedience. There remain revolutionary socialist groups, but this tradition of socialism has, for better or worse, mostly fallen out of favor among critical political scientists.

For critical political scientists, socialism has a special place. Regardless of how the term is deployed, socialism as an anti-racist, feminist, democratic, egalitarian, ecological post-capitalist world order is the goal of critical political science. This is not to suggest that all critical political scientists articulate their purpose explicitly in terms of socialism, or that all critical political scientists who do use the term use it in the same way, which would not be true. However, many critical political scientists do broadly aim to contribute to achieving a world beyond anti-democratic, exploitative, racist, (cishetero)sexist, imperialist capitalism and thus to the achievement of some kind of socialist alternative. Critical political scientists, however they identify, contribute to the socialist project by making political science serve the goal of “... building a more democratic and egalitarian economic, social, and political order” (Barrow 2022, 24).

BRYANT WILLIAM SCULOS

References

- Bakunin, Mikhail. 1972. *Bakunin on Anarchy*, edited by Sam Dolgoff. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 2022. “What’s in a Name? From New Political Science to Critical Political Science.” *New Political Science* 44, no. 1: 3–26.
- Bernstein, Eduard. 1993. *The Preconditions of Socialism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Engels, Friedrich. 1978. “Socialism: Utopian and Scientific.” *The Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd edn. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Fourier, Charles. 1971. *Design for Utopia: Selected Writings of Charles Fourier*, translated by Julia Franklin. New York: Schocken Books.
- Gallie, W.B. 1955–56. “Essentially Contested Concepts.” *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 56: 167–98.
- Goldman, Emma. 1969. *Anarchism, and Other Essays*. New York: Dover Publications.
- Gray, John. 1977. “On the Contestability of Social and Political Concepts.” *Political Theory* 5, no. 3 (August): 331–48.
- Holmstrom, Nancy, ed. 2002. *The Socialist Feminist Project: A Contemporary Reader in Theory and Politics*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Kaufmann, Moritz. 1888. *Christian Socialism*. London: K. Paul.
- Kautsky, Karl. 1910. *The Social Revolution*. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr.
- Leibowitz, Michael. 2006. *Build it Now: Socialism for the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Leibowitz, Michael. 2012. *The Contradictions of “Real Socialism”: The Conductor and the Conducted*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. 1978. “Manifesto of the Communist Party.” *The Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert C. Tucker. 2nd edn. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Pierre-Joseph Proudhon. 2004. *General Idea of the Revolution in the Nineteenth Century*. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications.
- Saito, Kohei. 2017. *Karl Marx’s Ecosocialism: Capital, Nature, and the Unfinished Critique of Political Economy*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Salama, Abdel Moghny Said. 1972. *Arab Socialism*. New York: Barnes & Noble.

Further readings

- Day, Meagan and Michal Uetricht. 2020. *Bigger Than Bernie: How We Go from the Sanders Campaign to Democratic Socialism*. New York: Verso.
- Fromm, Erich. 1955. *The Sane Society*. New York: Holt.

Hudis, Peter. 2013. *Marx's Concept of the Alternative to Capitalism*. Chicago: Haymarket.
Luxemburg, Rosa. 2006. *Reform and Revolution and Other Writings*. Mineola, NY: Dover.

See also

Communism; Marxism; Council Communism;
Democracy

130. Surplus value

In Marxian political economy, surplus value refers to the value created in the production process, which accrues to capital as the ultimate source of profit. Along with the classical political economists, Adam Smith and David Ricardo, Karl Marx subscribed to a *labor theory of value* which locates value production in the labor process. However, Marx advanced their theorizations by identifying labor exploitation as the origin of profit. Within a given work day, workers engage in the *socially necessary labor* required to ensure the self-reproduction of their class, as well as the *surplus labor* that creates a level of abundance in society beyond subsistence (Marx 2010 [1867], 226–38). Surplus labor is the source of the surplus value at the core of profitmaking in the capitalist system. Under capitalist class relations, the distribution of the total value produced is controlled by capitalists by virtue of their position as owners of the means of production. Ultimately, part of this value is returned to workers in the form of wages, but the remaining surplus value is kept by capitalists as profit.

For Marx, each commodity is composed of its use-value (the aspects of the commodity that fulfill a human need or want), exchange-value (the ratio at which the commodity is exchanged for others in the market), and value (defined as “socially necessary labor time,” or the average time it takes a society to produce the commodity). By defining value as a social average, Marx shows that value production is a competitive process, since individual capitalists can employ a range of strategies to produce value at a greater mass or rate than their rivals. Marx referred to value produced under these competitive conditions as *absolute surplus value* and *relative surplus value*, respectively.

To generate *absolute surplus value*, capitalists extend the length of the working day to force workers to perform more surplus labor and thus create more surplus value (Marx 2010 [1867], 187–306). Struggles over the length of the workday were central to labor actions in the United States during the early part of the twentieth century, when labor unrest compelled the Ford Motor Company to introduce the 40-hour work week (Marx 2010 [1867], 239–306, 406–11). During the current conjuncture, working hours, in

addition to wages and working conditions, were a major issue in the 2021 pandemic strike wave, which swept through industries as diverse as food processing and healthcare.

To generate *relative surplus value*, individual capitalists speed up production as they attempt to beat the average time it takes to produce a good or service (Marx 2010 [1867], 317–25). Under this scenario, technological and organizational advancements reduce the necessary labor required for production, allowing for more time in the workday devoted to surplus labor and thus the generation of more surplus value (Marx 2010 [1867], 412–39). Speedups remain a key competitive strategy for capitalists today. Although we may tend to locate value production on the factory floor, Marx defined the transportation of commodities as productive of value. Transportation is thereby subjected to similar competitive impulses to raise labor productivity. Delivery workers in the logistics sector, for example, are under immense pressure to meet daily package quotas – a pressure reinforced by a new generation of surveillance technologies that monitor workers’ every movement.

Capitalists may also collectively strategize to lower the value of labor-power, which is set by the total value required to reproduce a worker. If the value of labor-power declines, the portion of the workday devoted to necessary labor declines and the portion devoted to surplus labor increases, thus increasing the overall production of surplus value. Practically speaking, this means that access to cheap and accessible basic necessities (or *wage-goods*) allows capitalists to put downward pressure on wages. Historically, the repeal of the British Corn Laws in 1846 allowed British industrial capitalists to repress wages that had been rising for decades by opening domestic markets to the importation of cheap U.S. grain. More recently, the wage repression occurring during the period of neo-liberalization was, in part, enabled by the deluge of low-cost goods (produced by hyper-exploited labor in the Global South) which flooded U.S. markets through the global supply chains of retailers like Walmart and Amazon.

The idea of surplus value, as with Marxian value theory more broadly, remains controversial when it is defined as an economic tool for quantifying value production and distribution, particularly when converting values to prices

(the so-called “transformation problem”). Nonetheless, critical political scientists can build on these insights to answer key questions about capital-labor-state relations in the present and future. What are the prospects for continued labor organizing and strike actions over wages, hours, and working conditions as the world transitions past the pandemic economy? How are race, gender, and identity politics leveraged to catalyze or quell these labor organizing efforts? Will it be politically possible to adequately compensate the producer (producer-consumer) labor that drives the creation of digital market data and social media content? What is the logic of surplus value production in the gig economy and how do the pressures facing gig workers compare to traditional workers? How might pro-labor public policies relieve these pressures? How might issues surrounding labor exploitation and wage-good production change with significant rounds of re-shoring or deglobali-

zation? Answering these questions requires understanding capitalism’s dynamic logics as political-economic strategies of surplus value creation and distribution.

DEAN SNYDER

References

Marx, Karl. 2010 [1867]. “Capital: A Critique of Political Economy, Volume 1.” In *Marx and Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 35. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Further readings

Fine, Ben. 1989. *Marx’s Capital*, 3rd edn. Houndsmill, Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan.
Mandel, Ernest. 1970. *An Introduction to Marxist Economic Theory*. New York: Pathfinder Press.

See also

Alienation; Exploitation; Marxism

131. Syndicalism

Syndicalism is a strategy for organizing workers into a federated syndicate of industrial and trade unions (i.e., one big union) for the purpose of advancing the collective economic and political interests of the working class. Importantly, the syndicate is considered the embryo of a new form of social organization being developed within the womb of capitalist society, where workers build the organizational and political capacities to create a self-administered and “stateless” society. Louis Levine (1912, 10) traces the origins of syndicalism to the International Workingmen’s Association (1864–76), which was established by Karl Marx and others to unite European and U.S. trade unions, as well as socialist, communist, and anarchist organizations, into a single international federation with a common program of working-class struggle. Syndicalists sought to abolish the capitalist system of wage-labor by replacing private property in the means of production with worker ownership and worker self-management and by eliminating competition among workers through a cooperative commonwealth. In pre-figuring such a society, Marx (2010 [1870–71], 334) concluded that the Paris Commune of 1871 “was essentially a working-class government, the produce of the struggle of the producing against the appropriating class, the political form at last discovered under which to work out the economical emancipation of Labour.” Frederick Engels (1990 [1891], 181) later echoed Marx’s view that in the Paris Commune the working class had created a non-state political form of self-governance.

The theory of syndicalism was to unify the working class by creating organizational solidarity and developing working class consciousness. Syndicalists encouraged workers to engage in direct class struggle at the point of production by demanding higher wages, improved working conditions, and more control over the workplace. When workers went on strike to advance these demands against employers, it would simultaneously draw workers into a direct, and often violent, confrontation with the capitalist state, which would mobilize its repressive apparatus – police, national guard, military, courts, and jails – to “protect private property” and to reestablish “law and order” (Trautmann 1997

[1912], Sorel 1972 [1906]). As workers’ organizational skills, class consciousness, and capacity for self-defense were hardened by these encounters, syndicalists foresaw a day when all workers would simultaneously engage in a “general strike” that would paralyze and implode the capitalist system; thus, allowing the embryonic new society of federated, self-governing workers, to emerge from the ashes of the old society (Haywood 1917; Sorel 1972 [1906]). In the U.S., the Industrial Workers of the World attempted to put this vision into practice in the operation of their strikes, notably based upon their experience in Goldfield, Nevada, where after several months of periodic strikes they came to control the workplace and rejected the idea of the labor contract (St. John 2001 [1917]).

The origins of syndicalism were originally “non-political” insofar as syndicalists initially sought to achieve purely economic goals in the industrial sector by representing the economic interests of workers. However, to the degree that workers cannot pursue these goals without frequent violent encounters with the state, which intervenes to protect the interests of the capitalist class – owners of the means of production – syndicalism was inevitably drawn into questions of “politics.” The most notable expressions of the syndicalist philosophy were the Industrial Workers of the World in the United States, the *Generale du Travail* (CGT) in France, and the numerous general strikes in Europe and the United States following World War I (Mott 1922). Following the Paris Commune, perhaps the greatest practical success of syndicalism was during the Spanish Civil War and its legacy in the highly successful Mandragon Cooperative.

Syndicalists emphasize self-reliance, self-defense, and mutual aid among workers as the primary means of building a syndicalist society. Proletarian violence becomes necessary when capitalist private security forces and the state repressive apparatus enter the class struggle on the side of the capitalist class, although the general strike was viewed as the ultimate and most effective weapon in the struggle for a syndicalist society. Thus, syndicalists also opposed wars waged by the state, as well as other types of political conflicts that fostered a narrow patriotism, rather than international working class solidarity. Therefore, syndicalists have opposed standing armies and navies as nothing more

than the tools of capitalist imperialism, which shed the blood of workers to advance the economic interests of the capitalist class and the political interests of state elites. In this respect, syndicalists are profoundly “anti-political” and “anti-statist” to the extent that the state, and most political institutions, primarily defend and advance the interests of a ruling class. For syndicalists, the protection of property and the preservation of class distinctions are the primary functions of the state and, therefore, to participate in state-oriented political activities is to reinforce the very system that maintains the exploitation of the working class (Mott 1922, 26–7). For example, Sorel (1972 [1906], 71) dismissed parliamentary socialism as “a social policy founded on middle class cowardice, which consists in always surrendering before the threat of violence.” Similarly, most syndicalists have viewed efforts to secure ameliorative economic and social legislation by political means as a waste of time that dissipates working-class energies.

This infusion of “anarchism” into syndicalism has led many to call it “anarcho-syndicalism” (Rocker 1938) due to their opposition to all forms of the state, whether monarchical, oligarchical, or so-called democratic (Mott 1922, 31–2). The syndicalists have tended to view all forms of the state as inherently corrupt, because regardless of their form states enforce and legitimate the laws that allow for the economic exploitation of the working class. Thus, for syndicalists, the only form of legitimate governance is direct self-governance by the people whether in neighborhoods, communes, or industry. Syndicalists are profoundly suspicious of representative bodies, which they view as nothing more than open-ended debating societies that legitimate ultimately paternalistic decisions that maintain workers and others

in a state of dependency and subordination. Thus, syndicalism focuses on the complete dismantling of the existing state in order to reconceive the notion of governance as direct self-governance and liberation through direct action.

STACY MADDERN

References

- Engels, Frederick. 1990 [1891]. “Introduction to Karl Marx’s *The Civil War in France* (1891).” In *Marx-Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 27, 179–91. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Haywood, Big Bill. 1917. *The General Strike*. Chicago: I.W.W. Publishing Bureau.
- Levine, Louis. 1912. “Syndicalism.” *The North American Review* 196, no. 680 (July): 9–19.
- Marx, Karl. 1986. “The Civil War in France. Address of the General Council of the International Workingmen’s Association.” In *Marx-Engels Collected Works*, Vol. 22, 307–50. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Mott, Rodney, L. 1922. “The Political Theory of Syndicalism.” *Political Science Quarterly* 37, no. 1 (March): 25–40.
- Rocker, Rudolph. 1938. *Anarcho-Syndicalism*. London: Secker and Warburg.
- Sorel, Georges. 1972 [1906]. *Reflections on Violence*. New York: Macmillan.
- St. John, Vincent. 2001 [1917]. *The IWW – its History, Structure and Methods*, edited, with Foreword and Epilogue by Mark Damron. Available at <https://archive.iww.org/about/official/StJohn/10/>.
- Trautmann, William E. 1997 [1912]. “Direct Action and Sabotage.” In *Direct Action and Sabotage: Three Classic IWW Pamphlets of the 1910s*, edited by Salvatore Salerno. Chicago: Charles.

See also

Direct Action; General Strike; Mass Strike; Economic Democracy

132. Vanguard

Communists are said in the *Communist Manifesto* to constitute “practically, the most advanced and resolute section of the working-class parties of every country, that section which pushes forward all the others,” while having over the mass of the workers, theoretically, “the advantage of clearly understanding the line of march, the conditions and the ultimate general results of the proletarian movement” (Marx and Engels 2010 [1848], 497). Though the term itself was not yet employed, the passage traces the parameters of the vanguard of the proletariat, the rubric under which classical Marxists and especially Leninists have grappled with issues of socialist leadership in the struggles of the workers and oppressed people. The “line of march” proceeds through the class struggle without, despite the best wishes of utopians or reformers, transcending it or reconciling its opposing sides. So long as the social relations of capital prevail, the struggle between labor and capital is irreconcilable and it is thus incumbent upon those who would act in the van of workers’ struggles to orient themselves amidst class conflict on the assumption of its irreconcilability. Befitting its formulation at an early stage of the working-class movement, Marx and Engels’ sketch was abstract but the conjunction of practice and theory it invoked was suggestive of a process whereby varying forms of vanguard might emerge according to varying stages and circumstances of the class struggle.

While the notion of vanguard was generalized in the Marxism of the Socialist International (1889–1914), its abstract character was congealed in its leading exemplar, the German Social-Democratic Party (SPD). In Karl Kautsky’s authoritative commentary on the SPD program (1892), the vanguard of the proletariat rests upon an identification of the Marxist political project and organization of the SPD with particular, advanced sections of the working class, identified in terms of the positional quality of working in the most advanced (productive, socialized) forms of organization of capitalist production. Where the logic of capitalist production is supposed to transform particular struggles into universal class struggle, the position of these most advanced strata bears the unity of the whole working class. Divisions between

the advanced and the backward strata of the working class are thus presumed resolved through the unfolding of capitalist development and the challenge of negotiating political unity across such divisions theoretically eclipsed and practically marginalized. And the representation of class unity in the institution of the Marxist party occluded effective recognition of the latent contradictions within the working-class movement. Though grounded upon a strategic need for a cohesive class struggle for political power (see Bebel 1898), this stance might be thought vulnerable to the anarchist claim that the pretension to represent the proletariat came down to the ambition to act in its stead rather than to foster the independent activity of the working masses.

In Russia, where Marxist intellectuals had to contend with competing claims from populists and bourgeois liberals to hegemony in the democratic revolution to overthrow the tsarist regime, the problem of the role of vanguard would be posed with particular acuity. This circumstance spawned a distinction between spontaneity and (theoretically informed) consciousness: the spontaneous working-class movement figured not only as the mainspring of socialist agency but also as a target of bourgeois ideology and strategy and the struggle for hegemony required not only conscious resistance to the varying forms of bourgeois influence but also the capacity to align potential allies (peasants, oppressed nationalities, etc.) with the struggles of the workers. The shifting circumstances of the struggle prescribe a capacity on the part of those in the van to readjust theory and adapt practice in accordance with the spontaneously shifting contours of the battlefield. Indeed, for Lenin, the working class establishes its political identity only in rallying other forces around itself. It is in this context that Lenin could assert, in *What Is to Be Done?* (1902, 370) that “the role of vanguard fighter can be fulfilled only by a party that is guided by the most advanced theory.” The effective intervention of the vanguard of the proletariat in the class struggle would depend upon its organization into a political party distinct from the spontaneous working-class movement as such. With Lenin’s analysis of imperialism and the establishment of a socialist beachhead in Russia, this approach to vanguard political agency would spread in

working-class and progressive movements around the globe.

Drawing upon Marx's thesis that the working class must be the author of its own emancipation, Lenin's critics, notably the Menshevik Pavel Axelrod (1904) and the Polish Marxist Rosa Luxemburg (1904), cautioned that a rigid distinction between the vanguard and the spontaneous movement of the working class could displace the logic of historical materialism with an idealistic account of political agency and provide a rationale for the subordination of the workers' agency to the authority of revolutionary intellectuals. Marxist intellectuals should concern themselves with fostering the independent political activity of the workers, whence a genuinely proletarian vanguard would emerge. The concern with workers' self-activity has fed persistent undercurrents in western Marxist thinking and animated a critique of the pretensions of would-be Bolshevik vanguards that would influence how vanguard language is received more broadly.

A cognate term, "avant-garde," predicated of innovative or cutting-edge works of art and artists, indicating a critical stance vis-à-vis the conformism of mainstream culture, has informed the Frankfurt School's criticism of the mass society of consumer capitalism (see Adorno 1982 [1962]) and shaped the relevant discursive context. Where the Leninist notion contrasts the spontaneous movement of the workers and the conscious agency of those who would be its vanguard, the distinction at work with the Frankfurt School is between the critically thinking and therefore liberated individual and the passively conformist or even authoritarian masses. Where the relation between spontaneous and conscious activity permits us to think of leadership as weaving together the threads of agency into a movement and thereby inflecting the direction of

the struggle, if the avant-garde leads, it is by education or by example, symbolically and prefiguratively enacting a cutting-edge critique.

ALAN SHANDRO

References

- Adorno, Theodore 1982 [1962]. "Commitment." In *The Essential Frankfurt School Reader*, edited by Andrew Arato and Eike Gebhardt, 300–18. New York: Continuum.
- Axelrod, Pavel 1976 [1904]. "The Unification of Russian Social-Democracy and Its Tasks." In *The Mensheviks in the Russian Revolution*, edited by Abraham Ascher, 48–52. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Bebel, August. 1898. "Assassinations and Socialism." *Marxist Internet Archive* at www.marxists.org/archive/bebel/1898/11/02.htm accessed December 20, 2022.
- Kautsky, Karl 1971 [1892]. *The Class Struggle*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Lenin, V.I. 1961 [1902]. "What Is to Be Done?" In *Collected Works*, Volume 5, 347–568. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Luxemburg, Rosa 1970 [1904]. "Organizational Questions of Russian Social-Democracy." In *Rosa Luxemburg Speaks*, edited by Mary-Alice Waters, 152–75. New York: Pathfinder Press.
- Marx, Karl and Engels, Friedrich 2010. [1848]. "Manifesto of the Communist Party." In *Marx and Engels Collected Works* Volume 6, 477–519. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Further readings

- Dan, Theodore 1970. *The Origins of Bolshevism*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Camejo, Peter 1984. "Problems of Vanguardism." *Marxist Internet Archive* at www.marxists.org/archive/camejo/1984/19841001.htm accessed December 20, 2022.
- Shandro, Alan 2015. *Lenin and the Logic of Hegemony: Political Practice and Theory in the Class Struggle*. Chicago: Haymarket Books.

PART IV

PEOPLE

133. Althusser, Louis

Louis Pierre Althusser (b. October 16, 1918–d. October 22, 1990) was a French structural Marxist, best known for his symptomatic reading of Marx and his theories of conjuncture, contradiction, ideology, and interpolation. Born into a Catholic pied-noir family in French Algeria, Althusser served in the French military, was captured in 1939, and spent five years in a German prisoner of war camp. After the war he pursued his academic studies at École Normale Supérieure in Paris, staying on to teach philosophy until 1980. His re-engagement with Marx paved the way for various post-Soviet Marxisms. Over his career Althusser taught many significant mid-century French theorists (including Pierre Bourdieu, Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, and Jacques Rancière), many of whom would distance themselves from his structuralist approach thereby initiating what would become known as post-structuralism.

A committed French Communist Party (PCF) member, Althusser nonetheless criticized the party's Stalinist leanings. This seemingly contradictory position stemmed from Althusser's materialist philosophy, which made him skeptical that philosophy detached from an organized party could make meaningful political change. Therefore, Althusser understood his engagements in Marxist philosophy as a political intervention into the PCF, at a time when the party drew heavily upon Marx's recently translated early writings to explain away Stalinism as resulting from the faults of an individual. Althusser rejected this reading in an exchange known as the "humanist controversy." These collected essays were first published in French Communist Party journals and later collected as *For Marx* (Althusser 1970, 9).

In 1965 Althusser led a highly influential reading group on Marx's *Capital*. In the introduction to *Reading Capital*, the published essays from that seminar, Althusser notes that their reading of Marx took place within the particular "*conjuncture*," which included the "two great events" confronting the French Communist Party: Khrushchev's criticism of Stalin and the Soviet-Sino split (Althusser 1970, 10; Althusser and Balibar 1999, 10). As such, he saw these essays as a "theoretico-ideological *intervention* in that conjuncture" and the book's "theoretical

limits, lacunae and errors" are shaped by this moment (Althusser and Balibar 1999, 8). Rather than reading Marx as interpreted by the PCF, Althusser sought to read *Capital* using the scientific methods of analysis developed by Marx. This methodology of symptomatic reading identifies how the text is shaped by the limitations of the conjuncture in which it is produced.

Taken together, *Reading Capital* and *For Marx* pushed against the PCF's official reading of Marx by differentiating early, or humanist, writings from the mature Marx. This "epistemic break" marks the change from a philosophical to a scientific approach. Althusser argues that prior to 1845 Marx was not a scientific thinker, but still committed to the idealist thought of Feuerbach and the Young Hegelians. The "Eleventh Thesis on Feuerbach" and *The German Ideology*, however, constitute the beginnings of a systemic critique of capitalism not beholden to humanism or German idealism (Althusser 1970, 37). This initial break is further developed in the *Grundrisse* and comes to full fruition in *Capital*, where Marx opens "to scientific knowledge a new, third scientific continent, the continent of History" (Althusser 2001, 23).

Althusser argues that later Marx moves away from a traditional base-superstructure understanding of contradiction inherited from Hegelian dialectics, and instead views history in terms of non-linear causality or overdetermination. Althusser describes the conjuncture, a concept taken from Lenin's notion of the "current moment," as the particular organization of social relations at a given point in time: "the exact balance of forces, state of overdetermination of the contradictions as any given moment to which political tactics must be applied" (Brewster 1970, 250). For example, Althusser's seminal essay "Contradiction and Overdetermination" published in *For Marx* describes the Russian Revolution not as the result of a singular contradiction (between capital and the proletariat) but rather a culmination of a "vast accumulation of 'contradictions' that nonetheless 'merge' into a ruptural unity" (Althusser 1970, 100). The social whole, in other words, is organized by relations of contradictions existing absent cause.

Althusser's criticism of the PCF came to a head in 1966 when Roger Garaudy, the official party philosopher, officially rejected

Althusser's reading of Marx. As a consequence, Althusser found himself increasingly marginalized within the party. The uprisings of May 1968 put him at odds with many of his former students as well; protests were widely interpreted as a rejection of Althusserian structuralism, with "Structures Don't Take to the Streets" scrawled on walls across Paris (Dosse 1997, 115–17).

Shortly after May 1968 Althusser would write one of his most famous essays, "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatus (Notes Towards an Investigation)," in which he famously distinguished between "repressive state apparatuses" (RSAs; army, police, etc.) and "ideological state apparatuses" (ISAs; Church, school, family, etc.). While RSAs reproduce the relations of production through force, ISAs reproduce subjectivities through ideological interpolation.

Throughout his life Althusser suffered from mental illness, including bouts of severe depression. In November 1980 he suffered a psychiatric break that resulted in the strangling of his wife Rytman. While a court determined Althusser not responsible for the murder, this event resulted in even greater isolation and, after his death in 1990, obscurity. Recently, however, considerable interest has grown around the numerous unpublished manuscripts written during the last two decades of his life. These works focus on the politics of the encounter and theorize struc-

ture as open and radically contingent (for example: Althusser 1999, 2006).

ISAAC KAMOLA

References

- Althusser, Louis. 1970. *For Marx*. Translated by Ben Brewster. New York: Vintage Books.
- Althusser, Louis. 1999. *Machiavelli and Us*. Translated by Gregory Elliott. New York: Verso.
- Althusser, Louis. 2001. *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Althusser, Louis. 2006. *Philosophy of the Encounter: Later Writings, 1978–1987*. New York: Verso.
- Althusser, Louis, and Étienne Balibar. 1999. *Reading Capital*. New York: Verso.
- Brewster, Ben. 1970. "Glossary." In *For Marx*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Dosse, François. 1997. *History of Structuralism: The Sign Sets, 1967–Present*. Vol. 2. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Further readings

- De Ípola, Emilio. 2018. *Althusser, The Infinite Farewell*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Montag, Warren. 2013. *Althusser and His Contemporaries*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

See also

Structural Marxism; Marxist Theory of the State II; Ideology; Post-Marxism; Post-Structuralism

134. Amin, Samir

Samir Amin (September 3, 1931–August 12, 2018) was an Egyptian-born Marxist economist (1978), political scientist, and world-systems analyst whose pioneering work focused on the problems of imperialism (1977, 2004, 2018) and underdevelopment (1976, 1990b) with a geographic emphasis on Africa (1973, 1977, 1998) and the Arab world (1978). Amin was a prolific writer who published books in English, French, and Arabic.

Amin was born in Cairo to a French mother and Egyptian father, who were both medical doctors. He received his early education in Port Said, Egypt, where he attended and graduated from a French high school in 1947. During this time, Amin became politicized and was drawn to Communism. He travelled to Paris for higher studies, where he received a second high school diploma in mathematics and a diploma in political science at Sciences Po (1952). He later graduated from INSEE (1957) with a degree in statistics and economics. His doctoral dissertation was published much later as the widely acclaimed *Accumulation on the World Scale* (1974). While in Paris, Amin became an active participant in political struggles through his membership in the French Communist Party.

In 1957, Amin returned to Nasser's Egypt, where he worked for some time in the government, but then moved to Mali to work in Mobido Keita's government before finally choosing Senegal as his African abode. He set up the Third World Forum of intellectuals belonging to Asia, Africa and Latin America in Dakar, and remained an active participant, and source of profound inspiration in theoretical and political struggles against imperialism until his death in 2018.

Amin (1977, 1990a, 2011) saw imperialism as an attribute of capitalism that was not just associated with the monopoly phase of capitalism, but with its entire history, and the division of the world between a "centre" and a "periphery" as the product of a single dynamic that characterized the system. The countries that constitute the so-called underdeveloped world were not just left behind in the race for development and had to "catch up" with the advanced capitalist countries, but were part of one single process that produced development at one pole and

underdevelopment at another. Amin (1978, 2018) argued that Marx's analysis of capital accumulation, which had been formulated for a single unit, the capitalist economy, had to be developed for the world as a whole consisting of the Center and the Periphery. Amin (1976) described this process as "the development of underdevelopment."

A key idea underlying the dichotomy between Center and Periphery was the transfer of surplus-value through the "normal" operation of capitalism from the Periphery to the Center. Arghiri Emmanuel (1972) had earlier introduced the concept of "unequal exchange" through which such a transfer occurred in the course of trade: the prices of products of the low-wage countries were lower and the prices of products of high-wage countries were higher than their respective "prices of production" that would prevail if the wages and the rates of profit were equalized across sectors; low wages thus both underlay and were explained by the phenomenon of "unequal exchange." Emmanuel's analysis, however, had presumed, without explaining why, that each country was tied to the production of a specific good.

Amin broke with this assumption to argue that if homogeneous labor did not obtain the same wage everywhere, then, even if the same good was produced everywhere using the same technology, and commanded a uniform price, this price would be lower than if the good was produced exclusively in the high-wage country. Underlying the advanced country's access to such lower-priced goods was a transfer of surplus from the low-wage country. *Any* wage-differential for homogeneous labor thus entailed a surplus transfer.

Such a wage-differential persisted, and widened over time through the rise in labor productivity that raised wages in the advanced countries but not in the periphery, because of the existence of vast labor reserves in the latter. These labor reserves did not get eliminated owing to the imperialist state's imposition of labor immobility across countries (given the natural limits on capital mobility).

It followed from Amin's (1990a) analysis that countries on the periphery had to "delink" from this process and set up an "auto-centered" (not necessarily "autarkic") trajectory of development; but this could not occur within the framework of capitalism since imperialism would not allow it, while the local bourgeoisie would not break with

imperialism. Amin was clear that “catching up” could not be the goal of delinking, but instead auto-centered development required co-operation among countries on the periphery. Amin was exposed in his youth to the anti-imperialism of the non-aligned movement and the spirit of the Bandung Conference was an abiding inspiration. This was especially important when the neo-liberal order, which Amin believed entailed not just the dominance of monopolies over a surrounding world of small capitalists, but the *exclusive* dominance of monopolies at the “center” held sway across the world (Amin 2018).

Amin’s (2010) historic sense made him reject what he called “Eurocentrism.” He observed that Europe’s global ascendancy had not been an abiding phenomenon throughout history, but was a late development arising from two specific events: the fifteenth-century incursion into the Americas, and the nineteenth-century burst of technology and conquest. Amin’s faith in a socialist future, even when capitalism appeared to represent the “end of history,” arose from the same historic sense: the transition from feudalism to capitalism had taken hundreds of years, which he believed would also be true of the transition to socialism.

PRABHAT PATNAIK

References

- Amin, Samir. 1973. *Neo-colonialism in West Africa*. Translated from the French by Francis McDonagh. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Amin, Samir. 1974. *Accumulation on a World Scale: A Critique of the Theory of Underdevelopment*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Amin, Samir. 1976. *Unequal Development: An Essay on the Social Formations of Peripheral Capitalism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Amin, Samir. 1977. *Imperialism and Unequal Development*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Amin, Samir and Robin Cohen. 1977. *Classes and Class Struggle in Africa*. Lagos: Afrografika Publishers.
- Amin, Samir. 1978. *The Arab Nation*. Translated from the French by Michael Pallis. London: Zed Books.
- Amin, Samir. 1978. *Law of Value and Historical Materialism*. Translated by Brian Pearce. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Amin, Samir. 1990a. *Delinking: Towards a Polycentric World*. Translated by Michael Wolfers. London: Zed Books.
- Amin, Samir. 1990b. *Maldevelopment: Anatomy of a Global Failure*. Translated by Michael Wolfers. Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Zed Books.
- Amin, Samir. 1998. *Africa and the Challenge of Development: Essays*. Ibadan, Nigeria: Hope Publications.
- Amin, Samir. 2004. *Liberal Virus: Permanent War and the Americanization of the World*. Translated by James H. Membrez. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Amin, Samir. 2010. *Eurocentrism: Modernity, Religion, and Democracy; A Critique of Eurocentrism and Culturalism*. Translated by Russell Moore and James Membrez. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Amin, Samir. 2011. *Global History: A View from the South*. Cape Town: Pambazuka Press.
- Amin, Samir. 2018. *Modern Imperialism, Monopoly Finance Capital, and Marx’s Law of Value*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Emmanuel, Arghiri. 1972. *Unequal Exchange: A Study of the Imperialism of Trade*. With additional comments by Charles Bettelheim. Translated from the French by Brian Pearce. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Further readings

- Wintle, Michael. 2021. *Eurocentrism: History, Identity, White Man’s Burden*. London and New York: Routledge.

135. Anderson, Perry

The English historian Perry Anderson (September 11, 1938–), a longtime editor of the London-based *New Left Review*, believed that he should have been born in China. His father worked for Chinese Maritime Customs, his elder brother Benedict was born in Kunming, and it was only by coincidence of a vacation that Perry's mother labored in London. After returning to China, war and political change led the Andersons to move several times, to California, Colorado, Ireland, and finally to England. By the time the brothers won scholarships to Eton, Britain's prestigious boarding school, their accents had changed several times. Neither, moreover, internalized the kind of nationalist feelings commonly instilled in children. The notion of the national state remained a curiosity that Francis Rory Peregrine Anderson would as an adult study with detachment.

Anderson from a young age sympathized with people in subordinate positions, at home and in the colonies. His leftist transnationalism, however, solidified just as Western governments co-opted the same cooperative language to justify their dominance on the world stage (Anderson 2002). The ascendancy of market fundamentalism, in fact, was something of a turning point for Anderson. He once called neoliberalism "the most successful ideology in world history" (2000, 13). Its rise marks a split between Anderson as a cautious optimist and as a cautious pessimist.

In 1962, Anderson became editor of the *New Left Review* (NLR). Rather than trust the European communist parties that took direction from Moscow, the editors believed that the public needed better information about why history had unfolded as it did. If socialists of the twentieth century were to effectively confront capitalism, Anderson reasoned, they would need an account of its origins. The journal sought to bring continental Marxism (in French, Hungarian, and Italian) to an English-speaking audience. The nation of England itself was to be analysed from the same global perspective.

The rebellion of 1968 fueled Anderson's optimism. The global protests of that year indicated that the potential for revolution had spread from postcolonial nations to the developed world. Anderson believed the

NLR could serve as part of the vanguard for socialist activists.

Anderson's own writings aligned with his editorial commitments. His most famous work was a single study presented in two books, *Passages from Antiquity to Feudalism* (1974a) and *Lineages of the Absolutist State* (1974b). West European capitalism, Anderson contended, was the product of processes that began in the ancient world. The slave, feudal, and capitalist modes of production occurred in a historically determined order, produced via a series of dialectical exchanges. The modern state, likewise, was also not a spontaneous creation but something that emerged from partially sovereign institutions in the Middle Ages. The age of absolutism, that period when princes and their aristocracies claimed total authority over their territories, was for Anderson an intermediate phase that possessed elements of both feudalism and capitalism.

His study was also notable for its totalizing perspective, which emphasized interconnections among various economic, political, social, and cultural forces. As he put it: "a totality is an entity whose structures are bound together in such a way that any one of them considered separately is an abstraction" (Anderson 1992, 58). Yet Anderson's totalization was not the application of structures onto specific events. To the contrary, his stated generalizations were usually followed by nuanced exceptions that enriched his prose (and occasionally cloaked his findings).

Anderson also totalized European Marxism. He produced, in less than a decade, three short volumes on the major thinkers who followed Marx and Engels (Anderson 1976, 1980, 1983). In the last of his "unpremeditated trilogy," however, Anderson wrote that he was surprised by world politics since 1968: "the flow of theory in these years did not run in the direction I had envisaged" (1983, 27). The rise of neoliberalism corresponded with a shift in Anderson's priorities. He concluded that capitalism had won the twentieth century and socialism remained far out of reach. Yet just as his prior optimism was restrained by political reality, his new pessimism was tempered by hope. Instead of organizing ideas for revolution, leftists should acknowledge defeat while remaining steadfast in their opposition to capitalism (Anderson 2000).

For his part, Anderson did not let up. In a series of books and essays, he surveyed Europe, India, Brazil, and the United States, as well as ideology and beliefs about power. He demonstrated how long historical forces could disappear only to return decades or centuries later. One work, *The New Old World* (2009), showed the deterioration of European modernity in economics, civilization, and culture (see Williams 2020, 155–60). Though he no longer saw socialism on the horizon, Anderson remained dedicated to the idea that liberation came from understanding history. Against the neoliberal assertion that capitalism and utopia were the same, he exposed the powerful and reinterpreted the past. For Anderson, such steps were necessary in the fight for twenty-first-century socialism.

GREGORY P. WILLIAMS

References

- Anderson, Perry. 1974a. *Passages from Antiquity to Feudalism*. London: Verso.
- Anderson, Perry. 1974b. *Lineages of the Absolutist State*. London: Verso.
- Anderson, Perry. 1976. *Considerations on Western Marxism*. London: Verso.
- Anderson, Perry. 1980. *Arguments within English Marxism*. London: Verso.
- Anderson, Perry. 1983. *In the Tracks of Historical Materialism*. London: Verso.
- Anderson, Perry. 1992. *English Questions*. London: Verso.
- Anderson, Perry. 2000. “Renewals.” *New Left Review* II/1 (January/February): 1–20.
- Anderson, Perry. 2002. “Internationalism: A Breviary.” *New Left Review* II/14 (March–April): 5–25.
- Anderson, Perry. 2009. *The New Old World*. London: Verso.
- Kreisler, Harry. 2001. “Reflections on the Left from the Left: Conversation with Perry Anderson.” *Conversations with History*. <https://conversations.berkeley.edu/anderson> 2001.
- Williams, Gregory P. 2020. *Contesting the Global Order: The Radical Political Economy of Perry Anderson and Immanuel Wallerstein*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Further readings

- Blackledge, Paul. 2004. *Perry Anderson, Marxism and the New Left*. London: Merlin Press.
- Elliott, Gregory. 1998. *Perry Anderson: The Merciless Laboratory of History*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Thompson, Duncan. 2007. *Pessimism of the Intellect? A History of New Left Review*. London: Merlin Press.

See also

Structural Marxism; Historical Marxism

136. Aronowitz, Stanley

Stanley Aronowitz (1933–2021) authored more than 20 books, most of them written while employed as a Professor of Sociology at the City University of New York (CUNY). He retired as a Distinguished Professor of Sociology. Despite his academic achievements, Aronowitz always considered himself an outsider as he was both a working-class activist and an academic, but never completely embodying either role. Aronowitz embraced this dual identity and once stated that “in short, I write ... from a liminal space. I am neither an insider, never having completed a course of study in an institution of post-secondary education, nor an outsider, since I have worked ... in a fair sampling of the range of colleges and universities comprised by the American academic system” (2000, xvii). This liminality characterized not only his educational background, but also his theoretical contributions. No matter what topic he addressed – whether education, epistemology, cultural studies, the labor movement, or general social theory – Aronowitz continually sought to both criticize mainstream concepts and methodologies, while retaining aspects of these discourses that he considered useful to revolutionary change.

Aronowitz commenced his career as an academic outsider when he was suspended from Brooklyn College as an undergraduate for his social activism. Instead of proffering the apology required of him by the university administration to resume his studies, he dropped out, obtained a factory job after participating in a political action, and then worked as a union organizer. This vocational shift did nothing to squelch his penchant for displeasing the leaders of established institutions. When working as an organizer for the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers Union, Aronowitz angered his superiors for criticizing the organization’s lack of democracy and because he was increasingly in contact with Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and other New Left organizations, a move that eventually precipitated his full shift back to academia. He chronicled his experience in the labor movement, and offered a general critique of what he believed to be the bureaucratic, undemocratic, and lethargic state of American unions in general, in his first widely read book, *False Promises*:

The Shaping of American Working-Class Consciousness (1974).

Much of Aronowitz’s academic work is grounded in a critical sociology of knowledge. In books such as *Science as Power: Discourse and Ideology in Modern Society* (1988), he questioned the allegedly “objective” basis of empirical scientific inquiry. He stressed that all methods in the physical and social sciences were constructed by historical circumstances, and thus were reflective of the power relations of their particular eras. His critique of scientific inquiry was not limited to its institutional practice – he also criticized the allegedly objective interpretations of Marxism, such as those advanced by the French structuralists. In books such as *The Crisis in Historical Materialism* (1990), *The Politics of Identity: Class, Culture, Social Movements* (1992), and *How Class Works* (2003), he criticized accounts of Marxism that posited the existence of independent historical processes grounded in economically determined notions of class. Instead, Aronowitz stressed the autonomy of culture and the agency of subaltern social groups to generate their own understandings of effective radical political strategy.

This led to his interest in cultural studies, reflected in books such as *Roll Over Beethoven* (1993), where he explored how groups could fuse class, gender, race, and other identities into new social movements reflective of multiple forms of oppression. He was also a founding editor of the journal *Social Text*, an important journal of cultural studies. Despite his emphasis on the importance of pluralism within left movements, and his seeming embrace of post-modernism, Aronowitz never abandoned his belief in the utility of the concept totality – both in the sense of an explanatory device which could be used to identify powerful social forces affecting the globe and as a political ideal on which to build transformative social movements.

With his turn to cultural studies, Aronowitz was primed to take up the analysis of perhaps the most fundamental generators of knowledge and culture in contemporary society: schools and universities. In books like *The Knowledge Factory* (2000), *Education Under Siege* (2003) with Henry Giroux, and *Against Schooling* (2008), he criticized the increasing corporatization of public grade schools and colleges. He further questioned the increasing

specialization and vocationalization of education, especially due to the fact that he saw many jobs that previously required specialized training as potentially being replaced by machines. As opposed to these educational trends, he advocated for the retention of a classical curriculum in yet another example of his inside/outside intellectual orientation. Although he disdained traditional methods of education, such as grades and set curriculum, he advocated for an expansion of the classical canon to include works by authors from oppressed communities, as well as the study of popular culture, because he strongly believed that “poor kids should read Plato” and other classical authors in order to hone their critical thinking skills and build an understanding of the historical origins of contemporary ideas.

One of his final major works, *Taking it Big: C. Wright Mills and the Making of Political Intellectuals* (2012) represents a distillation of his many attempts to fuse seemingly discordant traditions and political positions. To Aronowitz, Mills was also both an insider and an outsider – a professor at Columbia University who felt uncomfortable in elite academia; a leftist who both identified with the Marxist critique of capitalist exploitation and alienation, yet bristled at what he called its “labor metaphysic” which focused too closely on the working class as the only social group capable of bringing about radical transformation. Mills was a theorist who valued both the continental tradition of political and social thought and American pragmatism. Thus, Mills represented a paradigmatic “political intellectual” that Aronowitz admired as a model to be emulated by all. Mills’s influence on the New Left and its attempts to build a movement can also be seen in Aronowitz’s politics; most notably, his support of both left electoral efforts (he ran for governor of the State of New York as the Green Party nominee in 2002 and was active in many progressive-Democratic and third-party campaigns) and direct radical action.

In sum, like Mills, Aronowitz was a consummate political intellectual. His academic

work interrogated the relationship between knowledge and power and his activism centered on the institutions that produce knowledge within society – with each activity, action and scholarship, informing the other in both spheres of action.

JASON KOSNOSKI

References

- Aronowitz, Stanley. 1974. *False Promises: The Shaping of American Working-Class Consciousness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Aronowitz, Stanley. 1988. *Science as Power: Discourse and Ideology in Modern Society*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Aronowitz, Stanley. 1990. *Crisis In Historical Materialism: Class, Politics, and Culture in Marxist Theory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Aronowitz, Stanley. 1992. *The Politics of Identity: Class, Culture, Social Movements*. New York: Routledge.
- Aronowitz, Stanley. 1993. *Roll Over Beethoven: The Return of Cultural Strife*. Hanover, NH: Wesleyan University Press, University Press of New England.
- Aronowitz, Stanley. 2000. *The Knowledge Factory: Dismantling the Corporate University and Creating True Higher Learning*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Aronowitz, Stanley. 2003. *How Class Works: Power and Social Movement*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Aronowitz, Stanley. 2008. *Against Schooling: For an Education That Matters*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.
- Aronowitz, Stanley. 2012. *Taking it Big: C. Wright Mills and the Making of Political Intellectuals*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Aronowitz, Stanley. 2013. *Dead Artists, Live Theories, and Other Cultural Problems*. London: Routledge.
- Aronowitz, Stanley and Henry Giroux. 2003. *Education Under Siege: The Conservative, Liberal and Radical Debate over Schooling*. London: Routledge.

See also

Class; Critical University Studies; Intellectuals; C. Wright Mills; *Social Text*

137. Ashcraft, Richard E.

Richard Elden Ashcraft (September 26, 1938–November 1, 1995) was a political theorist and Professor of Political Science at the University of California, Los Angeles (1965–95). He was born in San Francisco and received a B.A. from Harvard University (1960). He earned an M.A. (1961) and Ph.D. (1966) in Political Science from the University of California, Berkeley. His teaching and research interests included the history of political thought, Marxist theory, and the methodology of the social sciences.

Ashcraft self-identified as a Marxist and many of his graduate students joined the Caucus for a New Political Science in the 1980s and 1990s. Ashcraft rebelled against the dominant norms of post-World War II political theory as established by George Sabine, Sheldon Wolin, and Leo Strauss, who approached political theory as a branch of philosophy. In contrast, in his graduate seminars at UCLA, Ashcraft would often state the counter-proposition that political theory is “a theory of the structure of society and how it changes over time.” Thus, he argued that political theory, and the interpretation of political theory, should be anchored in history, sociology, and political economy. Above all, Ashcraft understood political theory as a form of *political action*, that is, an ideological intervention in revolutionary politics (Althusser 1971). Consistent with this idea, Ashcraft’s methodological position had its own origins in the “Berkeley rebellion” of the 1960s, which he participated in as a graduate student. His colleague at UCLA, Eugene Victor Wolfenstein (1996, 373–4) observes that Ashcraft once told him:

A few days after I arrived [at Berkeley] and began teaching freshmen the basic principles of American government, that government – my government – was dropping bombs on North Vietnam. For the next eight years it seemed to me that I was living on the street, surrounded by thousands of others.

This political experience radicalized Ashcraft, although Wolfenstein dismissed Ashcraft’s claim that he was “no longer a liberal,” but instead suggests that Ashcraft’s political thought was wedged at the juncture of liberal and radical (Marxist) politics as evidenced by

his writings on John Locke, John Stuart Mill, and Karl Marx. Indeed, Ashcraft (1975, 1980, 1983) published articles that examine the nature and practice of political theory, while offering novel interpretations of Thomas Hobbes (Ashcraft 1978; Ashcraft 1988), Karl Marx (Ashcraft 1984), and Karl Mannheim (Ashcraft 1981).

However, Ashcraft is best known for his two books on John Locke; one on Locke’s actual role in revolutionary politics during the Exclusion Crisis in England during the 1680s (Ashcraft 1986) and the other an analytical treatment of Locke’s *Two Treatises* situated in the same historical context (Ashcraft 1987). The British political theorist John Dunn (1986, 366) praised Ashcraft as “one of the most effective and interesting analysts of Locke’s social and political thought for nearly two decades,” while observing that Ashcraft’s *Revolutionary Politics and Locke’s Two Treatises of Government* was “not only by far the most impressive political biography of Locke available but also the fullest study to date of ‘radical’ politics in England between the late 1660s and 1689.” At the end of his life, Ashcraft was working on a methodologically similar work about John Stuart Mill, where he asked how it was that the most important liberal thinker in history became a socialist (Ashcraft 1989; Ashcraft 1999).

Ashcraft enjoyed polemics and he argued that all political theory was fundamentally polemical in its origins and objectives. Thus, Ashcraft (1992) argued that careful thought should be put into *how* the history of political thought is interpreted within a contemporary context. In responding to critics of his methodological approach to political theory, Ashcraft (1992, 705) wrote that:

Two decades and a few thousand pages on Locke later, I now find myself replying to critics who have devoted almost no thought to the methodological problems of interpreting political theory as a precondition for whatever specific criticism they wish to make of my interpretive position on Locke ... [M]ethodology simply comprises the rules pertaining to what counts as evidence and how it is to be obtained.

Along these lines, Ashcraft was a ferocious critic of Sheldon Wolin’s *Politics and Vision* (2016) even though Wolin had been one of

his dissertation advisors. Wolin made the well-known argument in *Politics and Vision* (2016) that he was struck by the continuities in how philosophical concerns with “political order” always surfaced in the context of “crises.” Ashcraft was critical of Wolin for not pursuing this observation because once acknowledged it becomes increasingly difficult to analyse a political theory text as a response to crisis without examining the historical and sociological specificity of the crisis itself. Thus, rather than pursuing this most important observation, Ashcraft criticized Wolin for adopting a philosophical and methodological approach similar to Leo Strauss. Wolin adopted *philosophy* as the basis of political theory, rather than exploring the sociology of knowledge and theory of ideology that was implicit in his key observation about crises. As Ashcraft (1983, 524) observes:

As students, we had been told by Sabine, Wolin, and others that there was some kind of correlation between historical periods of serious social conflict and the production of ‘great’ political theories. Yet what, if anything, did we actually learn about the nature of these social conflicts and their relationship to political theory in our own society? ... For all that we were taught about the specific connections that might be drawn between political theorizing and class conflict, social movements, or political parties, and the practical dimensions of a political theory shaped by its emergence under such conditions, we might just as well have postulated a correlation between earthquakes and the production of political theory.

The philosophical understanding of political theory thus not only begs the question of authorial intention in the context of concrete historical conditions; it abdicates responsibility for understanding politics by failing to clarify the relationship between political philosophy and the real world of politics. Ashcraft found one methodological corrective to this philosophical approach to political theory in the work of Quentin Skinner. Skinner’s “devastating critique” (Ashcraft 1983, 534) of academic political philosophy outlined numerous problems with any methodological approach that focused on the text alone. In contrast to philosophical approaches to political theory, Ashcraft (1992, 710) argued that “reading texts over and over again will never supply us with a means of resolving the

problems as to why different inferences from the evidence produce conflicting but plausible interpretations of the same text.” Only an investigation of context could provide further evidence as to why one interpretation is more plausible than another interpretation. In Ashcraft’s (1983, 527–8) view, the tools of history and modern social science, rather than philosophy, should be employed by political theorists when interpreting the great works of political philosophy:

there have been attempts to view political theory within its historical context, to relate the problem of interpretation as applied to textual analysis to the general problem of interpreting the meaning of social action, to restore a sociology of knowledge approach to a place of prominence in the formulation of a methodology for the social sciences, and to understand social science or political theory in terms of ideology, rather than vice versa.

However, Ashcraft went beyond Skinner in his understanding of what constitutes the proper context for interpreting a text. For Skinner, authorial intent is at the center of discovering a text’s political meaning. Ideologies remain textual – and the context remains texts in relation to other texts. For Ashcraft (1992, 712), the linguistic context is certainly a central feature in interpreting political theory, but Ashcraft shifted the emphasis of interpretation to the socio-economic context of political action. Ashcraft’s understanding of political theory puts a premium on explaining the dimensions of collective action – how social groups politically structure meaning and action. Political ideology as a guide to practical action must refer to action – not only to understanding (Ashcraft 1975, 5–6). The investigation of collective action as a feature of the transformation of social structure points to the dimension of critical realism in Ashcraft’s understanding of political theory that makes political theory a broader enterprise than the interpretation of utterances and intentions.

WILLIAM L. NIEMI AND CLYDE W. BARROW

References

- Althusser, Louis. 1971 [1968]. “Philosophy as a Revolutionary Weapon.” In Louis Althusser, *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, translated from the French by Ben Brewster, 11–22. New York: Monthly Review Press.

- Ashcraft, Richard. 1975. "On the Problem of Methodology and the Nature of Political Theory." *Political Theory* 3, no. 1 (February): 5–25.
- Ashcraft, Richard. 1978. "Ideology and Class in Hobbes' Political Theory." *Political Theory* 6, no. 1 (February): 27–62.
- Ashcraft, Richard. 1980. "Political Theory and the Problem of Ideology." *Journal of Politics* 42, no. 3: 687–705.
- Ashcraft, Richard. 1981. "Political Theory and Political Action in Karl Mannheim's Thought: Reflections Upon *Ideology and Utopia* and its Critics." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 23, no. 1 (January): 23–50.
- Ashcraft, Richard. 1983. "One Step Backward, Two Steps Forward: Reflections Upon Contemporary Political Theory." In *What Should Political Theory Be Now?*, edited by John S. Nelson, 515–49. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Ashcraft, Richard. 1984. "Marx and Political Theory." *Comparative Study of Society and History* 27, no. 4 (October): 637–71.
- Ashcraft, Richard. 1986. *Revolutionary Politics and Locke's Two Treatises of Government*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Ashcraft, Richard. 1987. *Locke's Two Treatises of Government*. London: Allen Unwin.
- Ashcraft, Richard. 1988. "Political Theory and Practical Action: A Reconsideration of Hobbes's State of Nature." *Hobbes Studies* 1: 63–88.
- Ashcraft, Richard. 1989. "Class Conflict and Constitutionalism in JS Mill's Thought." In *Liberalism and the Moral Life*, edited by Nancy L. Rosenblum, 105–26. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ashcraft, Richard. 1992. "The Radical Dimensions of Locke's Political Thought: A Dialogic Essay on Some Problems of Interpretation." *History of Political Thought* 13, no. 4 (Winter): 703–72.
- Ashcraft, Richard. 1999. "John Stuart Mill and The Theoretical Foundations of Democratic Socialism." In *Mill and the Moral Character of Liberalism*, edited by Eldon Eisenach, 169–90. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Dunn, John 1988. "Review: *Revolutionary Politics and Locke's 'Two Treatises of Government'* by Richard Ashcraft." *Journal of Modern History* 60, no. 2: 366–8.
- Wolfenstein, Eugene Victor. 1996. "In Memoriam to Richard Ashcraft, 1938–1995." *Political Theory* 24, no. 3 (August): 373–4.
- Wolin, Sheldon. 2016. *Politics and Vision* with a foreword by Wendy Brown. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

138. Baran, Paul

Paul A. Baran (b. August 25, 1909–d. March 26, 1964) was a Russian-born Marxian economist, who spent most of his life and career in the United States. Although born in Russia, his father (who was a Menshevik), moved the family to Lithuania in 1917 when Baran was only eight years old. However, the family soon left for Germany, where Baran completed his secondary schooling and eventually earned a Diplom-Volkswirt (M.A.) in Political Economy (1931) at the University of Breslau followed by a Ph.D. at the University of Berlin (1933). Baran fled the Nazi regime in Germany and immigrated to the United States in 1938, where he received a Master's degree from Harvard University.

During World War II and afterwards, Baran held many positions in the U.S. Government, including work for the Office of Price Administration, Office of Strategic Services, the U.S. Department of Commerce, and the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. In 1949, however, he resigned from the Federal Reserve to join the economics faculty at Stanford University. In 1951, when Baran was promoted to full professor, he was the only tenured Marxist in a U.S. economics department and he remained so until his untimely death in 1964.

Although Baran would not live to see the full impact of his intellectual influence, Baran played a central role, along with Paul M. Sweezy, in establishing the monopoly capital school of Marxian political economy – a critical scholarly tradition that examines the dynamics of capital accumulation in a global economic system dominated by large multinational corporations. Baran's first major work, *The Political Economy of Growth* (1957), documented the inefficiencies of capitalist economic development. Central to Baran's analysis was the concept of *actual economic surplus*, which he defined as the difference between a society's economic output and its consumption of essential goods and services. Although previous modes of production generated an economic surplus, capitalist development was distinct insofar as part of that surplus was reinvested in the productive apparatus to perpetuate further growth – a process Karl Marx identified as *capital accumulation*. Baran's advancement on Marx's insight was to juxtapose a socie-

ty's *actual economic surplus* with its *potential economic surplus*, the latter defined as the surplus that *could* exist under a socialist society which overcame the irrationalities that chronically plagued capitalism. Eliminating excess consumption (principally by upper income groups), unproductive labor, inefficiencies in the productive apparatus, and unemployment would maximize a society's economic capacity and better fulfill genuine human needs.

Baran and Sweezy's *Monopoly Capital* (1966) sharpened and expanded on the ideas in *The Political Economy of Growth*, as well as Sweezy's *The Theory of Capitalist Development* (1942). *Monopoly Capital* explained how the advent of large multidivisional, multinational corporations changed the dynamics of capital accumulation during the postwar period. In *Capital*, Marx had asserted that profit rates tend to fall with the introduction of labor-saving technologies that progressively decrease the mass of surplus value production relative to the organic composition of capital (constant capital). Baran and Sweezy argued that this process may have held during the competitive stage of capitalist development dominant in Marx's day, but they claimed that the economic surplus tends to rise in oligopolistic markets dominated by a few large corporations. Rather than compete on the basis of price, monopolistic and oligopolistic corporations tend to price goods and services to allow for generalized price increases, industry-wide profit growth, and chronic overaccumulation. The central problem for monopoly capital was finding outlets to profitably absorb this over-accumulated capital surplus.

Baran and Sweezy's concept of the *sales effort* outlined the strategies employed by corporations to absorb surpluses in ways that amplified consumer demand. Advertising and marketing campaigns, elaborate packaging and branding, superficial product design changes, and planned obsolescence became the political-economic drivers of modern consumer society, which has intensified in scope and scale since *Monopoly Capital's* first publication. Despite the sales effort's ubiquity, it has failed to fully arrest monopoly capitalism's tendency towards secular stagnation or to adequately fulfill human needs. Accordingly, Baran and Sweezy considered the sales effort a form of economic waste

that would not exist in a rationally ordered, socialist society.

Baran also made key contributions to our understanding of imperialism and uneven development. In *Political Economy of Growth*, Baran argued that foreign direct investment, foreign aid, and unequal trade relations function to draw out the economic surpluses produced in the world's peripheral economies. This surplus accrues to private capital in the advanced countries, which leads to chronic underdevelopment in the decolonized world. Baran's work thus laid out core ideas that were later advanced by dependency theorists and world systems theorists. In *Monopoly Capital*, Baran and Sweeney identified military expenditure as a primary means of surplus absorption, thus linking the dynamics of monopoly capital accumulation to U.S. imperialist ventures. Here, the political arm of the sales effort looms large, as corporate lobbying ensures the centrality of discretionary defense spending to the U.S. federal budget, while public relations campaigns drum up popular support for U.S. military interventions.

The criticisms of Baran's work, and of monopoly capital theory more broadly, have centered on its deviations from Marxist orthodoxy. The sales effort, for example, draws attention to the demand side of the economy. For Marxist theorists who give pride of place to surplus value production and the falling rate of profit (understood as supply-side phenomena), monopoly capital has more in common with the "underconsumptionist" approach of Keynesianism than Marxism. However, after Baran's death, the monopoly capital school cemented its place in the academic and activist left, principally through the socialist magazine *Monthly Review*, which would become a lodestar of leftist and Marxist thought under the editorial leadership of Sweezy (1949–2004), Leo Huberman (1949–68), Harry Magdoff (1969–2006),

Ellen Meiksins Wood (1997–2000), Robert W. McChesney (2000–04) and John Bellamy Foster (2000–present).

For critical political scientists, the work of Paul A. Baran and the monopoly capital school can serve as a framework for analysing a number of emerging phenomena. With corporate profits at record levels, issues of corporate power and surplus absorption strategies are of central importance today. For instance, there is the question of how political and social movements respond to the material economic waste associated with the digital sales effort (for example, the Right to Repair's campaign against the planned obsolescence of digital consumer technologies). Furthermore, monopoly-finance capital has adopted financial speculation as a key mechanism of surplus absorption and this strategy is now evolving in the context of new financial technologies such as cryptocurrency, which may be the harbinger of another looming financial crisis. Finally, we are left with the question of whether a sufficiently powerful left-right coalition can be forged to roll-back defense spending and tame the national security state that is a crucial component of wasteful and inefficient surplus absorption. To fully analyse these phenomena, critical political scientists need a political-economic understanding of monopoly capitalism and the evolving dynamics of capital accumulation and surplus absorption.

DEAN SNYDER

References

- Baran, Paul A. 1957. *The Political Economy of Growth*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Baran, Paul A. and Paul M. Sweezy. 1966. *Monopoly Capital: An Essay on the American Economic and Social Order*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Sweezy, Paul M. 1942. *The Theory of Capitalist Development: Principles of Marxian Political Economy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

139. Barber, Benjamin

Benjamin Barber (August 2, 1939–April 24, 2017) was a prolific American political theorist and public intellectual who promoted decentralized and participatory forms of democracy in both scholarly and civic activities. Barber received his B.A. from Grinnell College in 1960 and earned his Ph.D. in Government from Harvard University in 1966. He spent most of his academic career at Rutgers University (1969–2001), where he became the Walt Whitman Professor of Political Science and served as Director (1988–2001) of the Walt Whitman Center for the Culture and Politics of Democracy. In 2001, he joined the Department of Government and Politics at the University of Maryland as the Kekst Professor of Civil Society. In addition to his numerous scholarly publications, media appearances, and contributions to national and international periodicals exploring solutions to the challenges facing democracy, Barber pursued his theories through a variety of think tanks and public policy institutes, including CivWorld, which he founded and led as president, the USC Center on Public Diplomacy where he was Senior Fellow (2005–17), Demos (2007–12), where he was Distinguished Research Fellow, the Center on Philanthropy and Civil Society of the Graduate Center of the City University of New York, and the Fordham School of Law's Urban Consortium (2016–17), where he was the first Distinguished Senior Fellow. Barber also co-wrote and edited the prize-winning ten-part PBS/BBC documentary series *The Struggle for Democracy*. Following the publication of his 2014 book *If Mayors Ruled the World: Dysfunctional Nations, Rising Cities*, Barber launched the Global Parliament of Mayors to put his ideas concerning the problem-solving potential of cities into practice. Barber also worked as a consultant and an advisor to political organizations and leaders throughout the world, including former US President Bill Clinton, former Vermont governor and presidential candidate Howard Dean, former German President Roman Herzog, and, far more controversially, former Libyan strongman Muammar Gaddafi. Barber was the recipient of many honors and awards, including Guggenheim, Fulbright, and Social Science Research Fellowships, the Palmes Academiques/Chevalier from the

French Government (2001), the Berlin Prize of the American Academy in Berlin (2001), and the John Dewey Award (2003).

Barber had a profound impact on the sub-field of political theory in the United States, both as a founder and editor-in-chief (1974–83) of the interdisciplinary journal *Political Theory* and as a leading scholar of democracy, citizenship, and civil society. Barber (1971, 1974) explored some of the challenges to civic engagement in the modern world during the 1970s, but it was his 1984 book *Strong Democracy* that would leave the greatest impact on democratic theory and critiques of market-oriented practices and values. *Strong Democracy* examined the potential of ordinary citizens to overcome the alienating and disempowering tendencies associated with “thin” models of democracy that prioritize representation over more direct, or “thick,” forms of political engagement. Warning of the dangers that privatization, cynicism, and other outgrowths of liberalism pose to the possibility of self-government, Barber offered a number of suggestions to strengthen the power of ordinary citizens, including a proposal for a national initiative and referendum that would allow American citizens to weigh in on national legislation. Like other proponents of participatory democracy, the aim was not to do away with representative institutions but to make them more responsive to the needs of ordinary citizens and to provide opportunities for localized forms of direct and cooperative action (Barber 1988).

Barber's critiques of what would fall under the umbrella of neoliberalism and his interest in developing civic capacities for self-governance formed the basis of much of his subsequent work. Beginning with his international bestselling and widely translated book *Jihad vs. McWorld* (1995), Barber focused on the challenges confronting democracy in an increasingly globalized world still structured around an archaic and increasingly outdated nation-state framework. Barber pointed to the “paradoxical interdependence” between the balkanizing retribalization of identity-based politics that seeks to divide the world and the homogenizing globalization of a consumer-based market economy that ignores borders, both exhibit anarchic tendencies that deny the possibility of a common good. The only solution, Barber argued in *Jihad vs. McWorld* and several

subsequent works (Barber 1998, 2003, 2008), is to establish norms and practices of democratic citizenship centered around “a vibrant civil society where responsibilities and rights are joined together in a seamless web of community self-government” (Barber 1995, 276).

Barber’s work on civil society sought a more public-spirited and inclusive alternative to both libertarian models that tend to privilege consumer-oriented and market-based structures and communitarian models that tend to encourage overly ascriptive and particularistic attachments. This interest in empowering citizens of all backgrounds to make collective decisions in decentralized democratic spaces eventually led Barber to promote cities as pragmatic and cooperative centers of change that could more effectively and creatively deal with serious challenges such as climate change than increasingly “dysfunctional” nation-states (Barber 2014, 2017).

CLEMENT FATOVIC

References

- Barber, Benjamin R. 1971. *Superman and Common Men: Freedom Anarchy, and Revolution*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Barber, Benjamin R. 1974. *The Death of Communal Liberty: A History of Freedom in a Swiss Mountain Canton*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Barber, Benjamin R. 1984. *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Barber, Benjamin R. 1988. *The Conquest of Politics: Liberal Philosophy in Democratic Times*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Barber, Benjamin R. 1995. *Jihad vs. McWorld: How Globalism and Tribalism Are Reshaping the World*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Barber, Benjamin R. 1998. *A Place for Us: How to Make Society Civil and Democracy Strong*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Barber, Benjamin R. 2003. *Fear’s Empire: War, Terrorism, and Democracy*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Barber, Benjamin R. 2008. *Consumed: How Markets Corrupt Children, Infantilize Adults, and Swallow Citizens Whole*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Barber, Benjamin R. 2014. *If Mayors Ruled the World: Dysfunctional Nations, Rising Cities*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Barber, Benjamin R. 2017. *Cool Cities: Urban Sovereignty and the Fix for Global Warming*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

See also

Participatory Democracy; Neoliberalism

140. Barrow, Clyde W.

Clyde W. Barrow (b. February 15, 1956–present) was born in Alice, Texas to a working-class family. His father (Floyd) worked in the oilfields and his mother (Wanda) was a secretary. Barrow received his B.A. in Political Science from Texas A&M University at Kingsville (1977) and an M.A. and Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of California Los Angeles (1979, 1984), where he was a student of Richard Ashcraft, a Marxist political theorist, and Karen Orren, a founder of the new institutionalism in political science. Barrow joined the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth (1987–2014), where he spent much of his career directing the institution's Center for Policy Analysis. He moved to the University of Texas Rio Grande Valley (2014–present), where he serves as Department Chair.

At UMass Dartmouth, Barrow was active in the local faculty union as a member of the executive board (1996–2004), treasurer (1991–96, 2002–03), and president (1998–2000). He organized and chaired the union's first political action committee (1990–2005), which played a prominent role in the Massachusetts "Vote No on 2" campaign that prevented the repeal of the Massachusetts prevailing wage law. He was a regional organizer for the "Vote No on 3" campaign, which successfully prevented the abolition of Massachusetts' state income tax. For his work in labor and politics, Barrow received the Richard M. Fontera Memorial Award (1991) for making an "outstanding contribution to educating people about the meaning of social justice and the experience of working people." He received the Massachusetts Federation of Teachers Distinguished Service Award (2001) "in recognition of outstanding contributions to the union and our members." Barrow received the University of Massachusetts President's Award for Public Service (2004) as recognition for his "strong history of public service in providing vital research and analysis to the academic, legislative, business, and non-profit sectors across the Commonwealth."

Barrow is best known for his contributions to Critical University Studies and the Marxist theory of the state. Barrow's *Universities and the Capitalist State* (1990) is widely recognized as one of the founding, or antecedent,

works of scholarship in critical university studies (Barrow et al. 2021). In contrast to more mainstream histories of the American university, Barrow argues that corporations and corporate executives, in partnership with allied state elites, promoted the introduction of corporate business methods and organization into higher education for purposes of establishing stronger control over the universities and aligning their outputs with the economic requirements of capital accumulation. In building what he calls an ideological state apparatus, Barrow argues against mainstream historians by claiming that the development of the American university is more a history of academic repression than the winning of academic freedom by faculty. As a result of this book, and other work on higher education (Barrow et al. 2003) was appointed a Distinguished Guest Professor at Universidad del Guadalajara (2001).

In a more recent work, *The Entrepreneurial Intellectual in the Corporate University* (2017), Barrow suggests that university faculty must retake control of their institutions to establish "syndicalist universities" that are collectively owned, managed, and administered by faculty. The syndicalist university is an ill-defined concept in his later work, although he cautions readers that his concept of the "entrepreneurial intellectual" is *not* in the short term a broad strategy for subverting the bureaucratic corporatization of the university, but a limited micro-strategy operating at the margins of the bureaucratic corporate university" (Barrow 2017, xii).

Barrow intervened in the state debate with *Critical Theories of the State* (1993). Following the highly abstract theorizing that defined the state debate of the 1970s and afterwards, the main conclusion to Barrow's analysis was that state theorists needed to conduct "more comparative empirical and historical research," as well as basic "fact-gathering" as a basic precondition for moving state theory beyond the esoteric debates of the previous two decades. The book won the *Choice Outstanding Book of the Year Award* (1995) in political theory.

Subsequently, Barrow authored several articles on state theory and the state debate, but his *New Political Science* article on "The Return of the State" (2005) became an early call for a return to state theory after two decades of it being pushed into the intellectual background by poststructural-

ist, postmodernist, and globalization theory. This work built substantially on earlier research by Michel Aglietta, Leo Panitch and Sam Gindin, Robert Cox, and Stephen Gill. Following the global financial crisis and the Great Recession (2008–10), Barrow returned to these themes in *Toward a Critical Theory of States* (2016), which is perhaps the most meticulous reconstruction and analytical critique of the Poulantzas-Miliband debate that fractured state theory in the 1970s. As a result of his work on state theory, Barrow was invited to be a Guest Professor at Philipps-Universität Marburg (2003) and Kassel Universität (2005) in Germany, while later spending time as a Visiting Scholar at Universidad de Puerto Rico (2010).

Barrow became active in the Caucus for a Critical Political Science, which he joined in 1994. He has served as CCPS membership director (2003–05), APSA Program Chair (2008), treasurer (2015–20), and chair (2009–13). He is a member of the CCPS Coordinating Council (2003–present) and Publications Executive Committee (2005–present). In 2017, Barrow was a Co-Convenor of the 50th Anniversary Conference of CCPS (2017), with the stated purpose “to once again promote the growth of the Caucus for a Critical Political Science outside, but parallel to the American Political Science Association (APSA) and the regional political science associations with a competing vision of political science.” The conference has now become a regular part of the CCPS, which sponsors a biennial conference to promote the development and expansion of critical political science. In 2022, the Critical Political Science Section of the APSA recognized Barrow’s contributions to the organization with the Charles A. McCoy Career

Achievement Award, which is given annually to “a progressive political scientist who has had a long successful career as a writer, teacher, and activist.”

WILLIAM L. NIEMI

References

- Barrow, Clyde W. 1990. *Universities and the Capitalist State: Corporate Liberalism and the Reconstruction of American Higher Education*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Barrow, Clyde W. Barrow. 1993. *Critical Theories of the State: Marxist, Neo-Marxist, Post-Marxist*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Barrow, Clyde W., Sylvie Didou-Aupetit, and John Mallea. 2003. *Globalisation, Trade Liberalisation, and Higher Education in North America: The Emergence of a New Market Under NAFTA?* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 2005. “The Return of the State: Globalization, State Theory, and the New Imperialism.” *New Political Science: A Journal of Politics & Culture* 27, no. 2 (June): 123–45.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 2016. *Toward a Critical Theory of States: The Poulantzas-Miliband Debate After Globalization*. Albany, N.Y.: SUNY Press.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 2017. *The Entrepreneurial Intellectual in the Corporate University*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Barrow, Clyde W., Isaac Kamola, and Heather Steffen. 2021. “Class, Politics, and Higher Education: *Universities and the Capitalist State* Thirty Years On.” *Journal of Academic Freedom* 12 (September): 1–10.

See also

Critical University Studies; Theories of the State; Academic Repression

141. Bay, Christian

Christian Bay (1921–May 8, 1990) was a political scientist and activist and an eminent scholar of his generation. He vigorously explored and articulated the ideas of freedom, rebellion, peace, and justice. Bay directly challenged the American Political Science Association (APSA) Establishment as a co-founder of the Caucus for a New Political Science, and he challenged Western governments with his anti-war critique of what he called pseudo-politics.

Bay was born in Oslo, Norway, where he experienced and fought the horrors of World War II as an underground anti-war youth (Sedghi 1972). These formative years influenced his intellectual and political growth later in life. In his celebrated study, *The Structure of Freedom* (1958), Bay (1970, xxii) alluded to the various influences on his politics with the observation that: “Politically speaking, it all became urgent with the monstrosity of a Second World War, and with the indignity of having German occupants tell us in Norway that we belonged to the Master Race and therefore would be better off than the Czechs or the Poles.” Subsequently, Bay earned a law degree and a Ph.D. at the University of Oslo and served as a fellow at the Institute of Social Research in Oslo. While at the Institute, Bay (1970, xxii) observes that he learned to combine “general theory and methodology with a strong concern for social and political problems.” As the beneficiary of several scholarship programs, Bay visited and taught at several prominent American universities, including the University of Chicago, Harvard University, Michigan State University, the University of California, Berkeley, and Stanford University until he settled first at the University of Alberta and finally at the University of Toronto. Although his early encounters with notable scholars at these institutions were important to his intellectual development, he most admired the psychologist Abraham H. Maslow and his good friend H. Mark Roelofs, a political scientist at New York University. Bay’s war and anti-war experiences, as well as his early academic encounters framed his devotion to articulating and promoting theories of freedom, non-violence and real politics in contrast to pseudopolitics.

Bay was extremely meticulous in defining his theoretical concepts. In one of his most cited and re-published studies, “Politics and Pseudopolitics: A Critical Evaluation of Some Behavioral Literature,” Bay provided a sharp critique of behaviorism in American political science and the APSA. He concluded that behaviorists masked their “value-ridden” work with scientific jargon and used elaborate methodologies to conceal their “conservative” and “anti-political” positions. For Bay (1965, 40), “politics” referred to activities that aimed at “improving or protecting conditions for the satisfaction of human needs,” which he contrasted with “pseudopolitics” that denoted an “activity that resembles political activity but is exclusively concerned with either alleviation of personal neurosis or with promoting private or private inter-group advantage, deterred by no articulate or disinterested conception of what would be just or fair to other groups.” He (1965, 50) argued that “politics exists for the purpose of progressively removing the most stultifying obstacles to a free human development, with priority for the worst obstacles, whether they hit many or few – in other words, with priority for those individuals who are most severely oppressed.”

The twin concepts of politics and freedom run through most of Bay’s writings. He argued powerfully for the idea that human beings are potentially free, as well as rebellious against injustice, yet stifled by the state and society. In 1967, in one of his most highly cited and re-published works, Bay posed the pertinent question that political scientists must confront and ask themselves. He (1967, 90) asked: “Why do students active in protest movements tend to do better academically, and be more intelligent and intellectually disposed, compared to more apolitical students.” Based on extensive theoretical and empirical studies, Bay (1967, 90) suggested that “Every new human being is potentially a liberal animal and a rebel; yet every social organization he will be up against, from the family to the state, is likely to seek to ‘socialize’ him into a conveniently pliant conformist.”

Oppression and emancipation formed other aspects of Bay’s political theory. His second book, *Strategies of Political Emancipation* (1981) explored oppression in relation to strategies of emancipation and building solidarity across horizontal communities. Against “domination” as a mode

of oppression, Bay (1981, 170) argued for a “new political pedagogy” against “structural violence and other debilitating coercive oppression and deprivation,” while insisting on the need for a “variety of organized efforts to confront the established order with nonviolent acts and strategies of defiance, for the double purpose of sabotaging or undermining the existing agencies of oppression and of increasing the powers of self-determining individuals.” Against alienation as another mode of oppression, Bay (1981, 171) advocated for the “need to build horizontal communities ... to overcome our individualistic alienation and to defy the nation-state.” Thus, Bay called for the elimination of the power of privilege on the one hand, and the empowering of the underprivileged on the other.

Bay’s scholarship was imbued with activism and his early anti-war struggles clearly influenced his interactions with the APSA Establishment, which he challenged as one of the founders of the Caucus for a New Political Science (Barrow 2017). Bay sought to make the APSA more humane, representative, and responsive to constructing a better and non-violent world. More specifically, Bay (1972, 3) wanted “to democratize the profession and create incentive and climate for a politically responsible political science.” Bay (1972, 3) stated that:

We want to confront the APSA establishment, and eventually bring about its downfall. We want to promote a political science that serves, not the U.S. government or the privileges of the senior professorate in our universities, but the public interest: human needs, justice, human rights, man’s survival into the 21st Century. We want a critical political science, committed to radical inquiry, and to a more humane and safer world.

To these ends, Bay ran for the presidency of the APSA in 1969, but lost with 33.4 percent of the vote (Barrow 2017, 464). Bay was later elected to the APSA Executive Council (1971 to 1973). In 1973, as a member of the APSA Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom (CPEAF) Bay and Roelofs (a co-founder of CNPS) proposed a resolution condemning Henry Kissinger for “war crimes” and as “an accomplice in the terror bombing of Hanoi” during the Vietnam War. At the time, Kissinger was a member of the Harvard University faculty and U.S.

Secretary of the State. After much discussion on the floor of the APSA business meeting, the censure resolution was defeated 245 to 106 (Reed 1973, 30).

Bay’s professional activism reached inside his own university. As the Chair of the Political Science Department at the University of Alberta, Bay (1968) argued for student representation in all affairs of the institution and that “a time has arrived [for] a revolutionary change to form a self-governing academic community with the ultimate power in setting courses and hiring and firing profs ... and university presidents.” Given the controversy that his statements elicited on and off campus, Bay decided to resign from his post but after reconsidering his decision he decided to remain at Alberta for the time being and continue his struggles for academic democracy (*Edmonton Journal* 1968).

Much more can be said about Christian Bay. He would surely have condemned today’s imperialism and world-wide militarization, as well as the rise of neo-fascism. Bay’s interest in transforming politics served as an invitation to students’ inclusion in the profession, critical to this writer who was influenced by Christian Bay and became a pioneer in the study of gender politics in Iran. The Caucus’ Christian Bay Award for best paper presented at the annual meeting of the APSA draws attention to his ideas and reminds each new generation of political scientists what they inherited and how they might use it to change the world.

HAMIDEH SEDGHI

References

- Barrow, Clyde W. 2017. “The Political and Intellectual Origins of New Political Science.” *New Political Science* 39, no. 4: 437–72.
- Bay, Christian. 1965. “Politics and Pseudopolitics: A Critical Evaluation of Some Behavioral Literature.” *American Political Science Review* 59 no. 2 (March): 39–51.
- Bay, Christian. 1967. “Political and Apolitical Students: Facts in Search of Theory.” *Journal of Social Issues* 23, no. 3: 76–91.
- Bay, Christian. 1970 [1958]. *The Structure of Freedom*, 3rd Printing. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bay, Christian. 1972. “Chairman’s Report.” *The Caucus Surveys: Politics and Political Science* (Fall).

- Bay, Christian. 1981. *Strategies of Political Emancipation*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Reed, Roy. 1973. "Kissinger's Actions Challenged at Parley". *The New York Times*, September 6, p. 30.
- Sedghi, Hamideh. 1972. "Personal Conversation with Christian Bay." Washington, D.C.
- Sedghi, Hamideh 1991. "In Memory of Christian Bay: Scholar and Activist." *New Political Science* 10, no. 1: 3–15.
- "U Political Science Chief Quits." 1968. *Edmonton Journal*, October 22.
- University of Alberta. 1968. *The Gateway*, September 24.

142. Berg, John

John C. Berg (b. 1943) is an influential scholar, teacher, and activist within the Critical Political Science movement in the United States. Berg was born in Louisville, Kentucky and raised in Wisconsin. He earned a B.A. in English at the University of Wisconsin (1964) and a Ph.D. in Political Science from Harvard University (1975). His Harvard education included his time as a political prisoner, when he served nine months in the Middlesex and Plymouth County, Massachusetts House of Corrections for his participation in the 1969 occupation of Harvard's University Hall, which was part of a protest against the Vietnam War.

Berg was a Professor of Government at Suffolk University in Boston, where he taught from 1974 until retiring in 2016. During that time, he served the University and the Department of Government in myriad capacities, including Chair of the Department and Director of Graduate Studies. He was awarded three Fulbright Senior specialist positions (South Africa, Korea, and Ukraine). Berg was a frequent lecturer within the U.S. and beyond, presenting scholarly papers and lectures around the world, including England, France, Denmark, Wales, Canada, the Philippines, Argentina, and the former USSR.

As a scholar, Berg's work helped define the contours of a radical critique of the pluralist assumptions that have largely defined U.S. Political Science. His first book, *Unequal Struggle: Class, Gender, Race, and Power in the U.S. Congress* (1994), presented a Marxist interrogation of Congress, which situated the institution within the context of class structure, the needs of corporate capitalism, and a dominant liberal ideology. While pluralism assumes that government is a neutral umpire among conflicting interest groups who compete in a fair and open political process, Berg countered by viewing congressional action (and inaction) within the larger social conflict that lies in the gulf between the promise of democracy and the reality of corporate hegemony. Political struggle unfolds within the limits imposed by the imperatives of economic growth and capitalist prosperity. Whether the policy issues involve economic justice, labor, race, or gender equality, progressive social movements operate on an

unequal playing field that is woven into the fabric of the congressional committee system. Thus, while corporate power may not always achieve everything it wants from lawmakers, business priorities dominate public policy and define the very nature of what constitutes a "crisis" meriting immediate attention from lawmakers.

Berg's second book, *Teamsters and Turtles? U.S. Progressive Political Movements in the 21st Century* (2003) was an edited volume set against the backdrop of the 1999 protests at the World Trade Organization meetings in Seattle. The anthology traces the strategies of progressive anti-corporate movements challenging the priorities of neoliberalism, particularly the unity of organized labor (Teamsters) and the environmental movement (Turtles). It also explored connections between this global contestation and nine other progressive movements, with illuminating case studies including students against sweatshops, senior citizen groups, AIDS advocacy, and climate activists.

In *Leave It in the Ground: The Politics of Coal and Climate* (2019), Berg continues to highlight the role of social movements in creating political and economic change, this time through the lens of the damaging contributions of the coal industry to climate change. Berg begins with the claim that "coal has fueled the rise of modern civilization." If coal (combined with other fossil fuels) has been the foundation of modern affluence, this energy blessing has proven to be an environmental curse. The production and distribution of fossil fuels and the heat-trapping effects of carbon dioxide have been prime drivers of rising average global temperatures. Rich in exploration of the history of the coal industry, labor-management conflict, the desecration of air, water, and land, the book clearly explains the data-driven science behind environmental degradation. It also offers an analysis of the efficacy of global climate treaties and proposals for further action. Berg sees the urgent need for sustained activism (local, national, global) to pressure governments to stringently regulate the coal industry as he argues the obstacles to a path forward are more political than technical. The trajectory of extractive capitalism is toward climate catastrophes of growing magnitude. Challenging corporate interests is the only

alternative within the severe time constraints presented by the pace of climate change.

Beyond his teaching and scholarship, Berg was continually active within political science as an academic discipline. He was President of the New England Political Science Association and the Northeastern Political Science Association. Berg was a prominent member of the Caucus for a New Political Science (later the Caucus for a Critical Political Science) from the mid-1980s onward. He served the Caucus as Editor of its Newsletter, Secretary-Treasurer for 12 years, and Book Reviews Editor of *New Political Science* for 16 years. Berg played a pivotal role in establishing the Caucus as an Organized Section of the American Political Science Association with the goal of legitimizing a critical perspective within the discipline. For these indefatigable efforts, Berg was awarded the Charles A. McCoy Career Achievement Award in 2010 by the New Political Science Section of the APSA in recognition of “a progressive Political

Scientist who has had a long, successful career as a writer, teacher and activist.”

WILLIAM F. GROVER

References

- Berg, John C. 1994. *Unequal Struggle: Class, Gender, Race, and Power in the U.S. Congress*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Berg, John C., ed. 2003. *Teamsters and Turtles? U.S. Progressive Political Movements in the 21st Century*. Lanham, MD. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Berg, John C. 2019. *Leave It in the Ground: The Politics of Coal and Climate*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.
- Berg, John C., Chianna Calafiore, and Emma Nee. 2018. “Oral History Interview with John C. Berg (SOH-046).” Suffolk University Oral History Project, 35. Accessed January 25, 2023. <https://dc.suffolk.edu/soh/35>.

See also

Critique of Pluralism; Marxism; Social Movement Analysis; Environmental Justice; *New Political Science: A Journal of Politics & Culture*

143. Block, Fred

Fred L. Block (b. 1947–present) was born in New York City. He received a B.A. in History and Sociology from Columbia College, NYC (1968) and an M.A. and Ph.D. in Sociology from the University of California, Berkeley (1970, 1974), where he worked with David Matza (1930–2018) and Franz Schurmann (1926–2010). Block joined the Department of Sociology at the University of Pennsylvania (1974–88), which he chaired from 1988–90. He then joined the Department of Sociology at the University of California, Davis (1992–2010), where he acted as Chair (1992–2000), and where he now serves as Research Professor (2010–present). He is also president of the Center for Engaged Scholarship (2014–present), and has served on numerous editorial boards, including *Politics & Society*. Block has sat on the board of the Karl Polanyi Institute of Political Economy (Canada) since the institute's birth in 1989. He is the author of more than 100 peer-reviewed articles and book chapters. He has authored or coauthored seven books and edited or coedited two volumes. Block has always been an actively engaged public intellectual, publishing several policy commentaries in various venues, including *Boston Review*, *The Nation*, *The American Prospect*, and *Dissent*.

Block has provided major contributions to critical political science, economic and political sociology, sociology of welfare, and social theory, by addressing an impressively broad range of political economic issues, including state theory, the critique of mainstream economics, and by reinterpreting the thought of the famous Austro-Hungarian economic anthropologist and historian, Karl Polanyi (1886–1964).

In the same year that his doctoral dissertation on the organization of the international monetary system was published (1977a), Block presented his initial, pioneering contribution to state theory in “The Ruling Class Does Not Rule.” In contrast to both instrumental and structural Marxist positions, he argued that the capitalist ruling class can usually rely on state officials and lawmakers to protect corporate interests and the capitalist order, without direct control of state institutions (Block 1977b). Ten years later, in his influential book *Revising State Theory:*

Essays in Politics and Postindustrialism (1987), Block once again moved away from deterministic accounts of state-economy relations. He argued that despite corporate interests holding dominant power over policy formulation, diverging interests within the business community leave an important degree of autonomy to state institutions in the policy process. The book won the 1987 *Socialist Review Book Award*.

In the 1980s and 1990s, Block intervened in an extensive realm of political economic discussions (postindustrialism, the changing organization of the global economy, technology, employment) and in the critique of various economic concepts and measures, including: productivity, personal saving, and capital; welfare policies; the politics of taxation; basic income and the negative income tax. He returned to state theory with “Capitalism without Class Power” (1992). In this piece, Block argued that under financial capitalism, financial institutions, not the bourgeois or capitalist class, hold the dominant position within the “structural power of capital.” In this context, he suggested that state interventions could reduce the power of finance by controlling capital movements, mandating three-way management of financial institutions, and establishing quasi-public banks.

Starting in the mid-1980s, Block has developed a deep interest in the writings of Karl Polanyi and his critique of free-market economics, placing him amongst the world's leading scholars in the “rediscovery” of Polanyi. In addition to several journal articles, his most comprehensive work on Polanyi is perhaps *The Power of Market Fundamentalism* (2014), co-authored with Margaret Somers (University of Michigan). In contrast to common interpretations of Polanyi focusing on the embeddedness and disembeddedness of economy and society, Block and Somers argued that Polanyi analysed the “always and everywhere embedded economy” and saw the so-called free market as a dangerous utopia, impossible to be fully institutionalized by virtue of putting at risk human life, nature, and society. In this sense, the state is located at the center of the Polanyian “double movement”: in constructing the capitalist market system, state institutions destabilize society, but also respond to demands for social protection and welfare, and to the “selective statism” of the corporate

sector seeking to stabilize its own conditions of profitability.

In the 2000s, Block began a series of publications on the role of the U.S. federal government in funding and supporting the transition of new technologies from the laboratory to the marketplace. He showed that despite the free market rhetoric of Ronald Reagan and subsequent administrations, much of the business community had become heavily dependent upon the government's research and development initiatives (Block and Keller 2011). In his most recent works, Block continues to position the role of the state at the core of political economic analysis. In the volume *Democratizing Finance* (2022), edited by Block and Robert Hockett (Cornell University), the authors call for the democratic reform of financial institutions by state interventions, through protections from predatory borrowing and the transformation of finance centered on wealth accumulation to a means of reducing inequalities.

MATHIEU CHARBONNEAU

References

- Block, Fred L. 1977a. *The Origins of International Economic Disorder: A Study of United States International Monetary Policy from World War II to the Present*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Block, Fred L. 1977b. "The Ruling Class Does Not Rule." *Socialist Revolution* 7 (May–June): 6–28.
- Block, Fred L. 1987. *Revising State Theory: Essays in Politics and Postindustrialism*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Block, Fred L. 1992. "Capitalism without Class Power." *Politics & Society* 20, no. 3: 277–303.
- Block, Fred L., and Robert Hockett, eds. 2022. *Democratizing Finance: Restructuring Credit to Transform Society*. Brooklyn: Verso.
- Block, Fred L., and Matthew R. Keller, eds. 2011. *State of Innovation. The U.S. Government's Role in Technology Development*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Block, Fred L., and Margaret R. Somers. 2014. *The Power of Market Fundamentalism. Karl Polanyi's Critique*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Further readings

- Block, Fred L. 2018. *Capitalism: The Future of an Illusion*. Oakland: University of California Press.
- Block, Fred L. 1990. *Postindustrial Possibilities: A Critique of Economic Discourse*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

See also

- Theories of the State; Marxism (Institutional); Ruling Class; Capitalist Class

144. Boggs, Carl

Carl Boggs (b. July 22, 1937) was born in Long Beach, California, although he experienced a very mobile and often chaotic life during his early years as he was the son of a U.S. Navy officer who moved constantly. His father was aboard the battleship *Tennessee* at Pearl Harbor and served as the captain of different ships at Okinawa and elsewhere in the Pacific theater. After World War II, his ship was blown up at the Bikini Atoll A-Bomb test, where he was an observer. The young Carl lived in Seattle, San Diego, Norfolk, Virginia, Boston, upstate New York, and Santa Barbara, California. During World War II, after visiting relatives in Ossining, New York, Boggs became the target of an FBI investigation because he had innocently talked about his father's naval deployment – possibly making him the youngest person (age four) ever investigated by the FBI.

After graduating from high school, Boggs attended the University of California, Berkeley as an undergraduate, where he devoted all of his time to writing for the campus newspaper, *The Daily Cal*, where he maintains contacts to this day. After graduating from Berkeley, Boggs enlisted in the U.S. Army, attended language school (Russian), and was sent to West Germany to work as a Russian linguist for the Army Security Agency (part of the National Security Agency). As he finished first in his Russian class, Boggs worked at intercepting top-level Soviet government and military communications for two years. Along with his closest friend, he was scheduled to join an aerial surveillance mission but withdrew the day before takeoff. The plane crashed and everyone aboard perished in the crash.

Boggs returned to Berkeley, where he received his Ph.D. in political science (Soviet Studies) in 1970. Boggs was deeply involved in the Free Speech Movement, helped organize the Vietnam Day Committee in 1965 (one of the first antiwar teach-ins), taught in the Committee for Participatory Education, and helped organize the Peace and Freedom Party in 1968. He also served as president of the Graduate Students Association. When Boggs began work on his dissertation, he joined the Gramsci Institute in Rome (1967), where he participated in what became known as

the “extra-parliamentary left” during the late 1960s and 1970s.

After receiving his Ph.D., Boggs taught at Washington University in St. Louis (1969–77) and then at the University of California, Irvine, University of California, Los Angeles, University of Southern California, Carleton University in Ottawa, and Antioch University in Los Angeles, before concluding his career at National University in Los Angeles focusing on the education of inner-city working adults. While a professor of political science at Washington University, Boggs was active in protests against the Vietnam War, organized a series of conferences related to Marxist theory and politics, helped found the alternative paper *The Outlaw*, participated in the historic McDonnell-Douglas Project, worked with the *Telos* (journal) project, and taught several courses as part of alternative/leftist programs. He helped organize the first Earth Day activities in St. Louis in 1970. His work in St. Louis made him the victim of both University and FBI repression as documented in recent podcasts and films.

During this time, Boggs also wrote several articles on the life and work of the Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci for the journal *Socialist Revolution*, and these articles became the foundation of his book *Gramsci's Marxism* (1976), which helped introduce Gramsci's thought to U.S. scholars. He wrote a subsequent, more elaborate book on Gramsci, titled *The Two Revolutions* (1984). After leaving Washington University, Boggs wrote another 24 books, with ten of those books focused on topics related to the U.S. warfare state. He has also written several hundred articles, essays, and reviews on social movements, political theory, the ecological crisis, and film studies.

As Boggs moved to other universities, he taught not only in political science but in sociology, environmental studies, and film studies. He has been involved in the work of many journals, including *Socialist Revolution/Review*, *Liberation*, *Radical America*, *Theory and Society*, *Telos*, *Democracy and Nature*, *New Political Science*, and *Fast Capitalism* among them. Since 2000 he has been a regular contributor to the online magazine *CounterPunch* founded by Alex Cockburn.

Within the discipline of political science, Boggs has been active in both the Caucus for a New Political Science and the journal *New Political Science* since the late 1970s. He has

written many articles, along with two lengthy review-articles, across the succeeding years. He is a long-time member of the journal editorial board. His articles include work for the seminal volume on “U.S. Militarism in an Era of Globalization and Blowback” (March 2002), an anthology of several well-known authors, which later turned into a book, *Masters of War* (2003), and included contributions from Noam Chomsky, Chalmers Johnson, Michael Parenti, James Petras, and George Katsiaficas.

Boggs presented the Caucus plenary talk for 1980, titled “Politics of the Knowledge Industry,” which was published in *New Political Science* (1981). His article “Social Movements and the War Economy” (1981) is based on a Caucus presentation and won the CNPS award for best paper that year. Other noteworthy contributions to *New Political Science* include “Marxism and the Role of Intellectuals” (1979), “Postmodernism the Movie” (2002), “U.S. Grand Strategy and its Contradictions” (2004), “Pearl Harbor: How Film Conquers History” (2006), and “Hollywood and the Spectacle of Terrorism,” with Tom Pollard (2006), which received special recognition from the Caucus. In 2012, Boggs conducted a lengthy interview with Michael Parenti that was published in *New Political Science* and in 2016 he wrote a tribute to Sheldon Wolin, one of his mentors at Berkeley.

Aside from his long-term involvement with *New Political Science*, Boggs contributed regularly to the work of the Caucus and served as its Chair in 1998–99. In 2007, he received the Charles A. McCoy Career Achievement award from the Caucus. In recent years, he has served on the board of the Global Studies Association, during which time he has given several plenary talks at conferences around the United States. His recent books include: *The Hollywood War Machine* (2007), *Empire versus Democracy* (2011), *Origins of the Warfare State* (2017), *Fascism Old and New* (2018), and *Fugitive Politics – The Struggle for Ecological Sanity* (2022). In recent years he has been the subject of university-based oral history projects.

As of 2023, Boggs remains active in research, writing, speaking, and political work. He has been the host of three radio programs at station KPFF in Los Angeles, which is part of the Pacifica system. He organized a war-crimes tribunal in Los Angeles in

connection with the U.S. war in Iraq, working with such figures as former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark. For several years, he has worked extensively with Los Angeles peace activist Frank Dorrell, whose online work at his “Addicted to War” site has gained international attention.

As part of his long history within the antiwar movement, not only in the U.S. but in Europe and Canada, Boggs was personally involved in the protracted ordeal of activist Howard Mechanic, a student at Washington University in the early 1970s, who was forced to go underground in the wake of several violent protests within and around the university. After 30 years underground, Mechanic was arrested in Arizona and then finally freed after more than a year of efforts (by Boggs and others) to liberate him from federal prisons. In 2001, President Clinton’s last action was to pardon Mechanic, who remains politically active to this day. Among Boggs’ most recent articles is “The Saga of Howard Mechanic,” which appeared in *CounterPunch*, followed by a more updated version in the recent volume *Left in the Midwest* (2022).

CARL BOGGS

References

- Boggs, Carl. 1976. *Gramsci’s Marxism*. London: Pluto Press.
- Boggs, Carl. 1979. “Marxism and the Role of Intellectuals.” *New Political Science* 1, nos. 2/3: 7–23.
- Boggs, Carl. 1981. “CNPS Talk, 1980: Politics of the Knowledge Industry.” *New Political Science* 2, nos. 1/2: 89–97.
- Boggs, Carl. 1984. *Two Revolutions: Antonio Gramsci and the Dilemmas of Western Marxism*. Boston: South End Press.
- Boggs, Carl. 2001. “Postmodernism the Movie.” *New Political Science* 23, no. 3: 351–70.
- Boggs, Carl. 2003. *Masters of War: Militarism and Blowback in the Era of American Empire*. New York: Routledge.
- Boggs, Carl. 2004. “US Grand Strategy and Its Contradictions.” *New Political Science* 26, no. 3: 271–91.
- Boggs, Carl and Tom Pollard. 2006. “Hollywood and the Spectacle of Terrorism.” *New Political Science* 28, no. 3: 335–51.
- Boggs, Carl. 2006. “Pearl Harbor: How Film Conquers History.” *New Political Science* 28, no. 4: 451–66.
- Boggs, Carl. 2007. “Social Movements, the War Economy, and the Dilemmas of Political Strategy.” *New Political Science* 14, no. 1: 3–16.

- Boggs, Carl. 2007. *Hollywood War Machine: U.S. Militarism and Popular Culture*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Boggs, Carl. 2011. *Empire versus Democracy: The Triumph of Corporate and Military Power*. New York: Routledge.
- Boggs, Carl. 2012. "Reflections on Politics and Academia: An Interview with Michael Parenti." *New Political Science* 34, no. 2: 228–36.
- Boggs, Carl. 2016. "Tribute to Sheldon Wolin." *New Political Science* 38, no. 3: 428–31.
- Boggs, Carl. 2017. *Origins of the Warfare State: World War II and the Transformation of American Politics*. New York: Routledge.
- Boggs, Carl. 2018. *Fascism Old and New: American Politics at the Crossroads*. New York: Routledge.
- Boggs, Carl. 2022. *Fugitive Politics: The Struggle for Ecological Sanity*. New York: Routledge.

145. Bookchin, Murray

Murray Bookchin (January 14, 1921–July 30, 2006), who has also published under the pseudonym Lewis Herber, is best known as an anarchist philosopher and political ecologist, although in the late 1990s Bookchin became dissatisfied with what he called the “lifestylism” of many anarchists. Thus, in the last decade of his life, Bookchin came to advocate a form of libertarian socialism called “communalism,” which was an effort to synthesize Marxist, syndicalist, and anarchist thought (Bookchin 2015). Bookchin’s greatest contribution to critical political science was his development of the concept of social ecology.

Bookchin was born to Russian-Jewish parents in 1921. He was raised in Brooklyn in a left-wing family and joined the Young Pioneers (age 9–14), the Communist youth organization, and later the Youth Communist League (Biehl 2015, 6). He studied Marxism at the New York Workers’ (Communist) School, but in the 1930s he broke with Stalinism and eventually joined the Trotskyist Socialist Workers’ Party (SWP). In the 1940s, Bookchin was a trade union organizer, and party recruiter, for the SWP. Bookchin finally embraced anarchism in the late 1950s and published his first book, *Our Synthetic Environment* (1962) under the pseudonym Lewis Herber, which grafted environmental and ecological precepts to anarchist theory.

Bookchin’s desire for liberation inspired a discipline for constructive critique that never shied away from contradictions even within his own beliefs regarding Marx, communism, anarchism, and the radical left (Bookchin 2004, 1999). Some of Bookchin’s most profound work is his development of the field of social ecology to address the dualistic separation of human and non-human and how this separation results in ecological and environmental destruction. He believed that humans must transcend the “tendencies of more traditional science” to “dissect phenomenon and examine their fragments” (Bookchin 2005, 85). Social ecology “possesses a need to heal” the human and nonhuman divide through an ecologically driven moral ethos called dialectical naturalism.

Dialectical naturalism positions humans on an evolutionary path that is ever evolving: humans are “still in the process of becoming”

(Bookchin 1990), striving to become “nature rendered self-conscious” (Bookchin 2005, 75). Dialectical naturalism embraces human reason and an evolutionary trajectory towards greater consciousness and diversity. By using a continually evolving understanding of biological evolution humans can imagine “what if” questions based on an evolutionary continuum where we can move beyond representations of reality into actuality (McGowan 2022). Without doing this humanity “betrays its own evolutionary heritage” (Bookchin 1990, 63) of growing ecological diversity, which must include human evolution towards specialization, not hierarchy, mimicking the evolutionary process of the nonhuman world.

In fact, social ecology and the human evolution of reason and diversity can only happen through dismantling hierarchical systems such as class, racism, and patriarchy. Bookchin believes that all ecological problems derive from social problems rooted in both the domination of humans over each other and humans over the non-human world. Therefore, to remedy ecological problems, we must address these social problems and eliminate hierarchical social and institutional structures.

Bookchin adheres to a classical social understanding of the world, rather than one based on individualism. While individual freedom is important, Bookchin remarks that freedom is often used in relation to economic liberty, particularly by classical liberal thinkers who equate individual freedom with the marketplace. Instead, Bookchin (1999, 145) recognizes the individual as “mutable” and as “continuously intertwined with social evolution.” Bookchin (1999, 146) argues that “to conceive of the individual without society was as meaningless as to conceive of society without individuals.” Bookchin (1999, 147) believed that a truly free society fosters “the fullest degree of dissent” and, therefore, the practice of social ecology is direct democracy and democratic municipalism, where people are engaged in a decentralized politics of everyday life (Bookchin 1995).

Today, social ecology and Bookchin’s work, are making a resurgence in the twenty-first century due to growing concern for climate change, ecological crises, social inequalities, and a desire for communities to reclaim local power from nation-states. Bookchin’s work is represented in lived communities, such as the Kurdish-led revolution

in northeast Syria (Bielh 2022). Furthermore, Bookchin (2004, 11) reminds readers that social ecology and revolutionary thought must be put into practice in everyday life because if humans are “seeking to change society, the revolutionist cannot avoid changes in himself that demand the reconquest of his own being. Like the movement in which he participates, the revolutionist must try to reflect the conditions of society he is trying to achieve.”

MADDY KOCH

References

- Biehl, Janet. 2015. *Ecology or Catastrophe: The Life of Murray Bookchin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Biehl, Janet. 2022. *Their Blood Got Mixed: Revolution Rojava and the War on ISIS*. Binghamton, NY: PM Press.
- Bookchin, Debbie. 2022. “Interview: What is Nature?” Firestorm Books and Coffee. (April). Available at www.youtube.com/watch?v=UZ8092hVCKM.
- Bookchin, Murray. 1999. *Anarchism, Marxism and the Future of the Left: Interviews and Essays, 1993–1998*. Oakland, CA: AK press.
- Bookchin, Murray. 1995. *From Urbanization to Cities: The Politics of Democratic Municipalism*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.
- Bookchin, Murray. 1974. *Our Synthetic Environment*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bookchin, Murray. 2004. *Post-Scarcity Anarchism*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.
- Bookchin, Murray. 2005. *The Ecology of Freedom: The Emergence and Dissolution of Hierarchy*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.
- Bookchin, Murray. 1990. *The Philosophy of Social Ecology*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.
- Bookchin, Murray. 2015. *The Next Revolution: Popular Assemblies and the Promise of Direct Democracy; Essays by Murray Bookchin, edited and with an introduction by Debbie Bookchin and Blair Taylor*. New York: Verso Books.
- Bookchin, Murray. 2022. *The Philosophy of Social Ecology: Essays on Dialectical Naturalism*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.
- Bookchin, Murray. 2005. “What is Social Ecology.” In *Environmental Philosophy, from Animal Rights to Radical Ecology*, 4th edn, edited by Michael E. Zimmerman, J. Baird Callicot, Karen Warren, Irene J. Klaver and John Clark, 462–78. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- McGowan, Todd. 2022. “Interview: What is Nature?” Firestorm Books and Coffee. (April). Available at www.youtube.com/watch?v=UZ8092hVCKM.

See also

Anarchism; Ecology and Environmental Theory

146. Bronner, Stephen Eric

Stephen Eric Bronner (b. 1949–) was born in New York City. He is the son of German-Jewish exiles from Hitler who settled in the 1930s in the Bronx. He received his B.A. in Political Science and Comparative Literature from the City College of New York (1971) and his Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of California, Berkeley (1975). At CCNY, he studied primarily with the socialist historian Henry Pachter and Leo Löwenthal, an original member of the Frankfurt School of Social Research. It was in this intellectual circle of European émigrés to the United States that Bronner first learned about Marxism; the socialist labor movement; critiques of anti-Semitism; and Critical Theory. Later, he would carry through this progressive legacy in a number of books, including *Socialism Unbound* (2001), *Of Critical Theory and Its Theorists* (2002), *Reclaiming the Enlightenment* (2006), *The Bigot* (2014), and *A Rumor about the Jews* (2019). During his graduate studies with Norman Jacobson, a distinguished political theorist at UC Berkeley, Bronner received a one-year Fulbright Fellowship at the Universität Tübingen, Germany, where he took courses with Ernst Bloch, the legendary German philosopher of utopia. It was primarily from Bloch that Bronner inherited the impulse to integrate realism and idealism into a democratic socialist philosophy of practice.

Bronner joined the Political Science Department at Rutgers University at New Brunswick in 1976, where he spent his entire academic career as a political theorist until his retirement in 2019 as a Distinguished Board of Governors Professor of Political Science, Comparative Literature, and German Studies. He supervised nearly 50 Ph.D. dissertations and received several teaching awards. Bronner's massive scholarly output covers 25 books and 200 journal articles. His work was honored by the APSA's Michael A. Harrington Prize and Honorable Mention for the David Easton Prize. In 2005, he received the Charles A. McCoy Lifetime Achievement Prize from the New Political Science Section of the American Political Science Association.

Bronner is best known for his seminal contributions to two areas of political theory: socialist thought and theories of internationalism/cosmopolitanism. Regarding socialist thought, Bronner (1987, 1997, 2001) crafted insightful biographies and hermeneutical assessments of seminal thinkers such as Karl Marx, Rosa Luxemburg, Eduard Bernstein, Karl Kautsky, V. I. Lenin, and Léon Blum. In addition, he made significant theoretical contributions of his own, most importantly, the concept of the "class ideal." Bronner (2001) argues that this new concept allows socialism to be re-envisioned along critical-idealist lines as an ethical theory with a practical-democratic intent. Philosophically, Bronner (2001, xvii–xxix) favors a marriage of Hegel and Kant that would "link an immanent critique of socialism's historical development with a transcendent perspective from which to judge it." Hence, socialism can now exist only as a regulative ideal that guides the unfulfilled promises of the once revolutionary bourgeoisie toward the establishment of a distinct identity for the political claims of working people.

Bronner considers the class ideal sufficiently ideologically and politically potent to inspire eclectic social movements to counteract the neoliberal onslaught of the 1990s and 2000s. The class ideal also inspires Bronner's second theoretical innovation. His "new internationalism" is intended to confront the worst impacts of market globalism and the limitations of the nation-state in the face of pressing global problems such as climate change; growing disparities in wealth and well-being; asymmetrical power relations between the global North and South; and systemic human rights violations. Arguing that political theory and practice in the twenty-first century can no longer proceed from the perspective of the nation-state, Bronner argues for the articulation of the rising global imaginary as a progressive cosmopolitanism. Thus, Bronner emerged as an early advocate of a diverse alter-globalization movement on the political Left inspired by the vision of "another world" that was both politically possible and ethically desirable.

Bronner's theoretical turn toward justice globalism was matched by his practical human rights work in the Middle East and Africa. At Rutgers, he accepted an appointment as Director of Global Relations at the Center for the Study of Genocide, Conflict

Resolution, and Human Rights. This academic leadership position provided him with a suitable institutional platform for various civic diplomacy visits to Iran, Iraq, Palestine, Syria, Sudan, and Darfur. His pertinent experiences are vividly conveyed in books such as *Blood in the Sand* (2005) and *Peace Out of Reach* (2007). As a result of his increasing prominence in the human rights field, Bronner was appointed a member of the Executive Committee of the UNESCO Chair for Genocide Prevention; Executive Chair of US Academics for Peace; and Advisor to Conscience International. In 2011, he received the ME Peace Award by the Network for Middle Eastern Politics.

The most enduring intellectual achievement of Bronner's contribution to political science is to stake out a sophisticated critical-idealist position vis-à-vis an Old Left unwilling to abandon its teleological Marxist framework and a New Left overly sympathetic to postmodern deconstructionism. Stephen Eric Bronner's middle way in defense of the Enlightenment ideals of liberty, equality, and solidarity is most vividly on display in his firm embrace of a future-oriented hope in an emancipatory cosmopolitan rationalism that continues to fuel both his academic work and social engagement.

MANFRED B. STEGER

References

- Bronner, Stephen Eric. 1987. *Leon Blum*. New York, NY: Chelsea House Publishing.
- Bronner, Stephen Eric. 1997. *Rosa Luxemburg: A Revolutionary of Our Times*. University Park, PA: Penn State University Press.
- Bronner, Stephen Eric. 2001. *Socialism Unbound*. 2nd edn. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Bronner, Stephen Eric. 2002. *Of Critical Theory and Its Theorists*. 2nd edn. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bronner, Stephen Eric. 2005. *Blood in the Sand: Imperial Fantasies, Right-Wing Ambitions, and the Erosion of American Democracy*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press.
- Bronner, Stephen Eric. 2006. *Reclaiming the Enlightenment: Toward a Politics of Radical Engagement*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Bronner, Stephen Eric. 2007. *Peace Out of Reach: Middle Eastern Travels in the Search for Reconciliation*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press.
- Bronner, Stephen Eric. 2014. *The Bigot: Why Prejudice Persists*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Bronner, Stephen Eric. 2019. 2nd edn. *A Rumor About the Jews: Conspiracy, Anti-Semitism, and the Protocols of Zion*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.

See also

Socialism; Marxism; Critical Theory

147. Carver, Terrell

Terrell Carver (b. Boise, Idaho, 1946) is Professor of Political Theory at University of Bristol, UK (starting his career there in 1980), having taught at the University of Liverpool prior to that time. After receiving his BA at Columbia University in 1968, Carver was awarded the prestigious Kellett Fellowship to pursue his B. Phil. and D. Phil. at Oxford University, UK, working with the political theorists M. M. Goldsmith, Leszek Kolakowski, and Isaiah Berlin, among others. His first book publication – *Karl Marx: Texts on Methods* (1975) – would signal the important work he would continue to provide until the present day: the painstaking translation of, and interpretative commentary on, key texts within the Marxist pantheon, with the intent of restoring to Marx studies a keen sense of the political intentions of the author and the importance of the historical context to clarifying the particular text, all the while unerringly attempting to break from overly simplistic philosophical interpretations that all-too-often dominate Marx commentaries. Of special note, in this early text Carver translated the famous 1857 “Introduction” to Marx’s *Grundrisse*, a work that would shortly become a central text for a revival of Marx’s thought (see, for instance, Negri 1990). Moreover, Carver (1996) translated a number of other later (post-1848) works by Marx – including *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, and *The Civil War in France* – for the famous Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought series, and more recently engaged in the extensive new translation of the Feuerbach chapter associated with the fragments and texts that became known as *The German Ideology* (Carver and Blank 2014). For Carver, translation is already “interpretation,” becoming a delicate balance between restoring and enacting the meaning associated with text via an analysis of the author’s intentions, the historical and political context, and the dialogic production of the contemporary reader (Carver 1997).

In *The Postmodern Marx* (1998), all of these particular interpretative strategies are wonderfully engaged to open up incisive reflections on the contemporary relevance of Marx’s thought. This process takes seriously Marx’s intentions and the way in

which different literary tropes and figurations within Marx’s texts produce unique and varying political subjects in the author and readers alike. For Carver, Marx’s texts become weapons of resistance to ossified and orthodox readings of Marx, allowing creative openings for new possible readings of Marx’s texts and new potentials for Marx’s relevance today. But, as opposed to the then current work of Jacques Derrida in the (in)famous *Specters of Marx: The State of the Debt, The Work of Mourning, and the New International* (1994), Carver fastidiously attends to the actual intended meaning of the texts at hand, helping to ground one’s interpretation in ways that Derrida’s wayward and hermeneutically unanchored discourse cannot (Carver 1998b; for a critique of Carver’s interpretation of Derrida, see Macdonald 1998).

While Carver is internationally known as a Marx scholar, he is equally recognized for his work on Marx’s intellectual and political cohort, Friedrich Engels (see, for instance, Carver 2003 [1981]; 2020). Moreover, he has engaged the often-interesting way in which Marx and Engels worked together and influenced each other’s ideas. For Carver, Engels brought to the young Marx a keen sense of the necessity of political economy, thus setting the young Marx onto his path of articulating the materialist conception of history, while also unfortunately engendering an overly scientific and Darwinian vision of Marx’s position after his death, one that would haunt the Marxist tradition up to today. All in all, their intellectual relationship, and political partnership, was one riven with contradictions, tensions, and differences, yet also replete with true comradeship and fundamental agreement.

If Marx and Engels studies continue to be the foremost areas for Carver’s theoretical and interpretative engagements, he has also intervened in fundamental debates concerning men and masculinities in the history of political thought and international relations (see Carver 1996; 2005; 2014). Carver’s main contribution in this arena has been to argue for the necessity of taking seriously the political consequences of the articulation and characterization of men and masculinities in renderings of patriarchal relations, thus providing a much-needed expansion of the conceptual terms and characterizations in critical gender studies. For Carver, masculinity articulates “the masculine individual

as the generic representation of humanity,” in the process continuing to “confer power on men over women, but also to empower masculinized individuals and groups over feminized ones, and to create power hierarchies of men over men, as well as some masculinities over others” (Carver 2014, 115).

All in all, Carver’s ongoing work continues to provide incisive and important analyses that take seriously the commitments of critical political science, which, to paraphrase the famous words of Marx, wishes to not just interpret the world but change it in fundamental ways toward greater forms of democracy, justice, and equality.

BRADLEY J. MACDONALD

References

- Carver, Terrell. 1975. *Karl Marx: Texts on Methods*. New York: Barnes and Noble Books.
- Carver, Terrell. 1996. Ed. and Trans. *Marx: Later Political Writings*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Carver, Terrell. 1996. *Gender Is Not a Synonym for Women*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Carver, Terrell. 1997. “Translating Marx.” *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*. April–June, 22, no. 2: 191–204.
- Carver, Terrell. 1998a. *The Postmodern Marx*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Carver, Terrell. 1998b. “Specters and Vampires: Re-Reading Marx.” *Strategies: A Journal of Theory, Culture, and Politics*. Special Issue: *Theory in Dialogue*, no. 11/12: 70–84.
- Carver, Terrell. 2003 [1981]. *Engels: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carver, Terrell. 2005. *Men in Political Theory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Carver, Terrell. 2014. “Men and Masculinities in International Relations Research.” *The Brown Journal of World Affairs* 21, no. 1 (Fall/Winter): 113–26.
- Carver, Terrell. 2021 [1991]. *The Life and Thought of Friedrich Engels*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Carver, Terrell and Daniel Blank. 2014. *Marx and Engels’s “German Ideology” Manuscripts: Presentation and Analysis of the “Feuerbach Chapter.”* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1994. *Specters of Marx: The State of the Debt, The Work of Mourning, and The New International*. New York: Routledge.
- Macdonald, Bradley. 1998. “Specters of Derrida: Marx, Tradition, and Political Action – A Response to Terrell Carver.” *Strategies: A Journal of Theory, Culture and Politics*. Special Issue: *Theory in Dialogue*, no. 11/12: 85–90.
- Negri, Antonio. 1990. *Marx beyond Marx: Lessons on the Grundrisse*, translated by H. Cleaver, M. Ryan, M. Viano. Brooklyn: Autonomedia.

148. Castells, Manuel

Manuel Castells Oliván is a Spanish sociologist born in 1942 in Catalonia, Spain, who grew up travelling across the country during the fascist Franco regime (Kreiser 2003). These early experiences led him to join the anti-Franco movement in 1960, later taking part in the 1962 Asturias miners' strike. His political persecution later led him to seek asylum in France, where he obtained a Ph.D. in Sociology in 1967 at the University of Paris. There, he supported the 1968 student protests, which led to efforts to expel him from France, though he was able to remain thanks to the campaigns led by his doctoral supervisor, Alain Touraine (Webster 2007, 51).

His most notable work was conducted during his tenure at University of California, Berkeley (1979–2003), where he tackled issues like the economic and political implications of globalization, the rise of the information age, and the impact of technology on cities and societies. His underlying interest has been to understand the drivers of social change and power relations (Rantanen 2005, 138; Kreiser 2003). In 2003, Castells left Berkeley and assumed the Wallis Annenberg Chair of Communication Technology and Society at the University of Southern California. He has been awarded multiple honors, including the Holberg (2012), Erasmus (2013), and Balzan (2013) prizes for his contributions to social research. He is married to Russian sociologist Emma Kiselyova, with whom he coauthored *The Collapse of the Soviet Union* (1995) and *Russia in the Information Age* (2001), among other pieces.

Castells' first major book, *The Urban Question* (1972), introduced a Marxist approach to urbanism that "turned the field upside down" (Webster 2007, 51). He reconceptualizes urbanistic inquiry as an "ideological question" that needs to address not only the spatial dimension of cities, but also how they enable the accumulation of capital (Castells 1977, 421) and the reproduction of labor (Castells 1977, 429). Similarly to Henri Lefebvre and David Harvey, Castells challenged established ideas about urban spaces by shifting the focus towards the socially and physically constructed components of cities as part of political and economic systems

of power. He advanced the idea of cities as "spaces of flows," stressing their role as increasingly relevant centers for the transmission of information that, in turn, regulates the global economy. Concretely, he saw the spatial structure of the city as linked to the entire mechanism of its development, as stage and component of mass collective consumption (Castells 1977, 407).

Following the democratic transition in Spain in 1975, Castells re-established connections with his home country and held positions at Universidad Autónoma de Madrid and Universitat Oberta de Catalunya through the 1980s and 1990s. His most acclaimed work, *The Information Age*, was published during this period (1996–98), after 15 years of research. The dense, empirically informed, 1500-page trilogy attempts to capture the "state of the world" at the time. It has been labeled a "holistic grand narrative" and a work of "encyclopedic" documentation (Webster 2007, 54), comparable to the work of Weber and Marx (Rantanen 2005, 235). The first volume focuses on structural issues such as work, organization, and the economy; the second tackles culture, identities, social movements, and the media; and the final volume explores macro-social issues, such as supranational governance, and global security politics.

The Information Age's core argument is that the global restructuring taking place since the 1970s coincided with the expansion of an "informational mode of development" characterized by the growth of information and communication technologies (ICTs), which engendered a new type of society: *the network society*. Castells contends that information flows made possible by ICTs are fundamental to this new society, characterized by both growing internationalism and new modes of production based on knowledge and communication, where "networks are the fundamental stuff of which new organizations are and will be made" (Castells 1996, 168). Informational networks gained such relevance as to reshape global power relations and social identities by the turn of the century. The power dynamics of the contemporary era are therefore characterized by technologies with two crucial features: they are locally grounded but globally connected, and they are organized around networks rather than individual units (Castells 1996, 472).

An additional contribution to social theory is Castells' adoption of a Marxist lens to understand contemporary societies. His early academic work was influenced by French structuralist Marxism, especially by Louis Althusser's approach that underscores economic structures along cultural and political ones. His work has been crucial in rethinking Marxist theory in light of globalization and the new information and digital economies (Fuchs 2007, 160). He has called attention to the limited capacity of the traditional concept of working class and the primacy of economic relations to understand contemporary societies (Stadler 2006, 69). Instead, he has centered on how technology and communications shape social relations, contributing to broader debates on the relevance of Marxist theory in the twenty-first century and the need to reflect changing global conditions where "capital is globally coordinated, [and] labor is individualized" (Castells 1996, 476).

Castells' work has influenced a range of academic and activist communities, and has helped shape contemporary debates on communication, political mobilization, and social change. Nevertheless, critics argue that he often relies on sweeping generalizations about society that are often inattentive to individual agency (Stadler 2006, 76–8) and that seem to leave little room for societal change against the status quo (Webster 2007, 52). However, he has maintained in multiple pieces that social movements are often the driving force behind social and political transformation, and that understanding their dynamics is essential for creating more just and equitable societies (Castells 2012). Castells' work has also been criticized by Marxists and Neo-Marxists who argue the concept of "network society" seems to assume a break or discontinuity with other

forms of societal organization, most notably, capitalism (Fuchs 2007, 102).

MELISA ROSS

References

- Castells, Manuel. 1977 [1972]. *The Urban Question: A Marxist Approach*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Castells, Manuel. 1996. *The Rise of the Network Society. The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture Vol. I*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Castells, Manuel. 1997. *The Power of Identity. The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture Vol. II*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Castells, Manuel. 1998. *End of Millennium. The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture Vol. III*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Castells, Manuel. 2012. *Networks of Outrage and Hope: Social Movements in the Internet Age*. Cambridge, MA: Polity.
- Fuchs, Christian. 2007. *Internet and Society: Social Theory in the Information Age*. New York: Routledge.
- Kreisler, Harry. 2003. "Interview with Manuel Castells: Identity in the Network Society." *Conversations with History*, 6/2003. Institute of International Studies, UC Berkeley. September 9, 2001. Available at: www.youtube.com/watch?v=0GBB7U5mv0w, last accessed March 1, 2021.
- Rantanen, Terhi. 2005. "The Message is the Medium: An Interview with Manuel Castells." *Global Media and Communication* 1 (2): 135–47.
- Stadler, Felix. 2006. *Manuel Castells: The Theory of the Network Society*. Cambridge, MA: Polity.
- Webster, Frank. 2007. "Manuel Castells." In *Fifty Key Sociologists. The Contemporary Theorists*, edited by John Scott, 51–4. New York: Routledge.

See also

Structural Marxism; Post-Marxism; Global Studies; Theories of the State

149. Chomsky, Noam

Avram Noam Chomsky (December 7, 1928–) is Professor Emeritus at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (1955–2017) and Laureate Professor at the University of Arizona since 2017. Chomsky was born in Philadelphia and educated at the University of Pennsylvania. He earned a Ph.D. in Linguistics from Harvard University (1955). Chomsky's formal training is in linguistics and he has made landmark contributions to this field that led to him receiving a Kyoto Prize in Basic Sciences in 1988, among many other honors. However, a discussion of Chomsky's contribution to linguistics is outside the scope of this entry as he is best known to the wider public for his critical analysis of contemporary politics, especially American foreign policy.

Chomsky was interested in politics from an early age and was steeped in anarchist and libertarian-socialist literature. He became a public figure during the 1960s with his writings and activism, including civil disobedience, in opposition to the Vietnam War. Chomsky's early political articles, some published in the *New York Review of Books*, were collected in his first book of essays *American Power and the New Mandarins* (1969). Over more than half a century, Chomsky has produced over 100 books, including interview collections, directed to the general public, where he has commented on a wide range of topics from an independent, radical perspective. He has long been regarded, by critics and supporters alike, as one of the world's foremost public intellectuals, with influence among progressive activists globally. This entry focuses briefly on his critique of U.S. foreign policy, his view of the political role of intellectuals and the news media, and his ideas about the normative foundations for resistance and for aspirations to a democratic and egalitarian society.

Chomsky's initial political writings are marked by several analytical and normative positions that he has developed over the years, and that stand as contributions to critical political science. Chomsky differentiated his opposition to the Vietnam War from those intellectuals whose pragmatic rather than principled criticism focused on mistakes, incompetence, and good intentions gone awry, but assumed the legitimacy and

morality of America's global role. In contrast, Chomsky (1969, 11) asked the question, "What about opposition to the war on the grounds that we have no right to stabilize or restructure Vietnamese society?" For Chomsky, the widely held view of a basically benevolent American national purpose amounted to a kind of state religion, concealing the real drivers of the U.S. role in the world. In a concise statement of his analytic perspective on foreign policy, Chomsky (1982, 90) wrote in the late 1970s:

The United States, in fact, is no more engaged in programs of international good will than any other state has been. Furthermore, it is just mystification to speak of the nation, with its national purpose, as an agent in world affairs. In the United States, as elsewhere, foreign policy is designed and implemented by narrow groups who derive their powers from domestic sources – in our form of state capitalism, from their control over the domestic economy, including the militarized state sector.

Chomsky and his collaborator Edward S. Herman applied this perspective to the supposed pro-human rights orientation of U.S. foreign policy in the Carter years to argue that imperial ideology was being reconstructed after the Vietnam War. They drew a striking, and much debated, contrast between the enormous attention given by the press and pundits to Communist atrocities in Cambodia under the Khmer Rouge and the neglect of proportionally greater violence in East Timor perpetrated by U.S.-supported Indonesian forces (Chomsky and Herman 1979). In later books, Chomsky dismantled official accounts of U.S. policy in Central America in the 1980s, the many wars of the U.S. and Israel in the Middle East, and the attempts by the United States to remain master of the international order in the twenty-first century.

Chomsky's books are heavily documented and based on a wide reading of sources including scholars, journalists, and research and civil society organizations, as well as official statements and documents. As a political dissident, Chomsky responds forcefully to misunderstandings and attacks on his views. According to Chomsky (1969, 3250): "It is the responsibility of intellectuals to speak the truth and expose lies." Chomsky argues that truth telling is a public task that was abdicated by too many scholars and pundits

during the Vietnam War. Chomsky extended his critical analysis of opinion formation to the news media's role in the "manufacture of consent" for American foreign policy. The term was coined by Walter Lippmann in the 1920s and was used by Chomsky and Herman in their 1988 book on the political economy of the mass media. They developed a "propaganda" model that identifies five "filters" that impact news reporting in international affairs: ownership by for-profit media corporations; advertising as a source of revenue; reliance on information provided by government, business, and elite-connected experts; "flak" as a means of intimidating and disciplining the media; and anti-communism (later anti-terrorism) as an ideological control mechanism (Herman and Chomsky 1988, 2). The propaganda model has been assessed from various positions (Cohen and Rogers 1991, 18–25). Chomsky acknowledges that the news media is more open in recent times, partly in response to political activism that has brought new facts and opinions to public attention.

Chomsky has been reticent about drawing a tight connection between his linguistic theories and his political values. Nevertheless, it is possible to infer a view of human nature from his theory of generative grammar that includes capacities for freedom, autonomy and creativity, which might support a humane and just society. As Chomsky (1973, 394) once put it, albeit speculatively:

Language, in its essential properties and the manner of its use, provides the basic criterion for determining that another organism is a being with a human mind and the human capacity for free thought and self-expression, and with the essential human need for freedom from the external constraints of repressive authority.

Fighting for a better society involves long-term and short-term struggles, modest reforms and radical changes. As Chomsky (2022) said recently:

It's not reform or revolution: it's both ... I'd like to see the United States have a health system like other societies. That's nowhere near enough, but it's a significant reform ... We also ought to have a major social revolution in which health is a right, a guaranteed right, so you don't have to go through these hoops ... Those are not contradictory. Those are steps you take to try to change the world. Improve it when you can, try to overcome its fundamental problems by organizing committed revolutionary movements. The two are not in conflict.

JOSEPH G. PESCHEK

References

- Chomsky, Noam. 1969. *American Power and the New Mandarins*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1973. *For Reasons of State*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1982. *Towards a New Cold War: Essays on the Current Crisis and How We Got There*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2022. "The Proto-Fascist Guide to Destroying the World." Interview with David Barsamian, *Boston Review*, October 17: www.bostonreview.net/articles/the-proto-fascist-guide-to-destroying-the-world/.
- Chomsky, Noam, and Edward S. Herman. 1979. *The Political Economy of Human Rights*. Volume I, *The Washington Connection and Third World Fascism*; Volume II, *After the Cataclysm: Postwar Indochina and the Reconstruction of Imperial Ideology*. Boston: South End Press.
- Cohen, Joshua, and Joel Rogers. 1991. "Knowledge, Morality and Hope: The Social Thought of Noam Chomsky." *New Left Review* 1/187: 5–27.
- Herman, Edward S., and Noam Chomsky. 1988. *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*. New York: Pantheon.

Further reading

- Barsky, Robert F. 1997. *Noam Chomsky: A Life of Dissent*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rai, Milan. 1995. *Chomsky's Politics*. London and New York: Verso.

See also

Anarchism; Critical Media Studies; Intellectuals; Ideology; Theories of Imperialism and Empire

150. Cleaver, Harry

Harry Cleaver (b. January 21, 1944–) is a retired university professor, who has developed a global following for his decades of work contributing to what he calls “autonomist Marxism,” or a Marxism that focuses on the self-organized struggles of workers against capital, the state, political parties, and unions. While he came to prominence at the University of Texas-Austin (UT-Austin), Cleaver was already breaking ground as a young scholar developing a critique of the Green Revolution in grain production (Cleaver 1972, 1974) and reinterpreting Marxist theory.

While attending Antioch College, Cleaver held co-op jobs at the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago, on a farm in France, at the *New York Times*, and in the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington, D.C. He also spent an academic year in France studying at l’Université de Montpellier. After participating in the Civil Rights Movement, and as a result of the war on Vietnamese independence, he shifted his studies from biochemical research to economics. After graduating from Antioch, Cleaver attended graduate school in economics at Stanford University, where he was a founder of the anti-war Pacific Studies Center, which focused on US foreign policy. He began teaching economics at l’Université de Sherbrooke in Quebec and after three years accepted a job at the New School for Social Research in New York City. There he took part in resistance to the anti-worker austerity policies enacted during the fiscal crisis of 1974–76. During this organizing in NYC, he joined the *Zero*work collective alongside other militant scholars. The journal introduced the ideas of Italian *operaismo* (or Italian “workerism”) into the United States.

After being purged from the New School in 1976 by a coalition of students who did not like his kind of Marxism, Cleaver was hired to teach Marxist economics at UT-Austin – a result of being invited by students. According to Cleaver: “I spent the next 36 years helping students learn about what interested them: Marx, the history of economic thought, and the political economy of education and international crisis” (Ovetz 2023). While at UT-Austin, Cleaver taught undergraduate and graduate courses on Marx,

capitalist crisis, education, mostly in response to requests by students. Cleaver’s first book, *Reading Capital Politically* (1979), was the product of his class notes teaching Marx.

While at UT Austin, Cleaver supported various struggles by student activists. After the Zapatista rebellion in Chiapas, Mexico began he focused on solidarity support as part of a local group. This included setting up and running the Chiapas95 listserv for 12 years, which circulated news and solidarity efforts around the world. Cleaver wrote the introduction to the first collection of Zapatista communiqués, *Zapatista! The Documents of the New Mexican Revolution* (1994) and assisted in translating and publishing Subcomandante Marcos’ communiqués in *Conversations with Durito: Stories of the Zapatistas and Neoliberalism* (2005). As a result of this work, Cleaver wrote about a dozen articles about the role of cyberspace in gaining support for the rebellion around the world. During his more than three decades of teaching, Cleaver taught hundreds of graduate students in economics and other disciplines, some of whom have emerged as important scholars in their own fields. As part of his research, Cleaver assembled the Texas Archives of Autonomist Marxism, which has helped to popularize the field of autonomist Marxism.

Since retiring in 2012, Cleaver (2017a, 2017b, 2019) has continued writing and publishing on Marxian theory and various contemporary crises. While Cleaver has not received the same level of prominence or attention as other Marxist scholars, his influence on Marxism has been extensive and reaches far beyond the academy. His (1972) article on the contradictions of the Green Revolution and his (1974) later dissertation on its origins were the first thorough critiques of the development and the introduction of new high-yielding grains to fight peasant unrest. Cleaver’s (1976, 1977, 1982) subsequent articles on food as a weapon were the first to reframe that aspect of state policy in Marxist terms. The same was true of his later work on debt and class struggle (Cleaver 1990).

Cleaver’s (1979, 1982, 1986, 1992, 1993, 1999, 2017, 2019) work reinterpreting Marx has provided an alternative, autonomist perspective not only to more traditional interpretations of Marxism but also to others working in the tradition of what today is more commonly known as Italian workerism. Cleaver

was also instrumental in helping introduce the Italian philosopher Antonio Negri to the English-speaking world by co-translating his *Marx Beyond Marx* (Negri 1991). Cleaver's (1994 to 2009) work on the role of cyberspace in the Zapatistas' struggle made a seminal contribution to the study of the role of the Internet and social media in social struggles of all sorts. His decades of work on global working-class self-activity also preceded the re-emergence of self-organized worker struggles at Amazon, in the global gig work sector, and the current resurgence of global class conflict.

ROBERT OVETZ

References

- Cleaver, Harry. 1972. "The Contradictions of the Green Revolution," *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 62, no. 1/2: 177–86.
- Cleaver, Harry. 1972. "The Contradictions of the Green Revolution," *Monthly Review* 24, no. 2: 48–64.
- Cleaver, Harry. 1974. *Origins of the Green Revolution*. Dissertation. Stanford University.
- Cleaver, Harry. 1976. "Internationalization of Capital and Mode of Production in Agriculture." *Economic and Political Weekly* 11, no. 13: A2–A16.
- Cleaver, Harry. 1977. "Food, Famine and International Crisis." *ZeroWork*, no. 2: 7–70.
- Cleaver, Harry. 1979. *Reading Capital Politically*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Cleaver, Harry and Peter Bell. 1982. "Marx's Theory of Crisis as a Theory of Class Struggle." *Research in Political Economy* 5: 189–261.
- Cleaver, Harry. 1982. "Technology as Political Weaponry." In *Science, Politics, and the Agricultural Revolution in Asia*, edited by Robert Anderson, Paul R. Brass, Edwin Levy, and Barrie Morrison, 261–76. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Cleaver, Harry. 1986. "Karl Marx: Economist or Revolutionary?" In *Marx, Schumpeter & Keynes*, edited by Suzanne W. Helburn and David F. Bramhall, 121–46. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Cleaver, Harry. 1990. "Close the IMF, Abolish Debt and End Development: A Class Analysis of the International Debt Crisis." *Capital & Class*, no. 39 (Winter): 17–50.
- Cleaver, Harry. 1992. "The Inversion of Class Perspective in Marxian Theory: From Valorization to Self-valorization." In *Open Marxism: Theory and Practice*, Vol. II, edited by Werner Bonefeld, Richard Gunn, and Kosmas Psychopedis, 106–44. London: Pluto Press.
- Cleaver, Harry. 1993. "Theses on Secular Crisis in Capitalism: The Insurpassability of Class Antagonisms." In *Marxism Today: Essays on Capitalism, Socialism and Strategies for Social Change*, edited by C. Polychroniou and H.R. Targ, 87–97. Westport: Praeger.
- Cleaver, Harry. 1994. "The Chiapas Uprising and the Future of Class Struggle in the New World Order", *Riff-Raff: attraverso la produzione sociale* (Padova), March: 133–45.
- Cleaver, Harry. 1994. "Introduction." In *Zapatistas! Documents of the New Mexican Revolution*, 11–23. Brooklyn: Autonomedia.
- Cleaver, Harry. 1995. "The 'Space' of Cyberspace: Body Politics, Frontiers and Enclosures." *LawyerNet* (November).
- Cleaver, Harry. 1995. "The Subversion of Money-as-Command in the Current Crisis." In *Global Capital, National State and the Politics of Money*, edited by Werner Bonefeld and John Holloway, 141–77. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Cleaver, Harry. 1996. "The 'Space' of Cyberspace: Body Politics, Frontiers and Enclosures." *Women and Performance* 9, no. 17: 239–48.
- Cleaver, Harry. 1998. "The Zapatista Effect: The Internet and the Rise of an Alternative Political Fabric." *Journal of International Affairs* 51, no. 2 (Spring): 621–40.
- Cleaver, Harry. 1998. "The Zapatistas and the International Circulation of Struggle: Lessons Suggested and Problems Raised." Paper prepared for conference on Globalization from Below at Duke University, February 1998.
- Cleaver, Harry. 1998. "The Zapatistas and the Electronic Fabric of Struggle." In *Zapatista! Reinventing Revolution in Mexico*, edited by John Holloway and Eloina Peláez, 81–103. London: Pluto Press.
- Cleaver, Harry. 1998. *Zapatista: Neoliberalism, the Chiapas Uprising and Cyberspace*. Seoul, Korea: Galmuri Publishing House.
- Cleaver, Harry. 2002. "Work is Still the Central Issue." In *The Labour Debate: An Investigation into the Theory and Reality of Capitalist Work*, edited by Ana Dinerstein and Machael Leary, 135–48. Farnham, England: Ashgate.
- Cleaver, Harry. 2017a. *Rupturing the Dialectic: The Struggle Against Work, Money and Financialization*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.
- Cleaver, Harry. 2017b. *Teoria Kryzysu: Jako Teoria Walki Klas*. Poznań: Bractwo Trojka.
- Cleaver, Harry. 2019. *33 Lessons on Capital: Reading Marx Politically*. London: Pluto Press.
- Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional. 1994. *Zapatista! The Documents of the New Mexican Revolution*. New York: Autonomedia.
- Negri, Antonio. 1991. *Marx Beyond Marx: Lessons on the Grundrisse*. New York: Autonomedia.
- Ovetz, Robert. 2023. "Email Interview by Robert Ovetz with Harry Cleaver." April 14. Copy in author's possession.

Subcomandante Insurgente Marcos. 2005. *Conversations with Durito: Conversations with Durito: Stories of Zapatistas and Neoliberalism*. New York: Autonomedia.

Texas Archives of Autonomist Marxism, <https://la.utexas.edu/users/hcleaver/taalphacomplete.html>.

See also

Theories of the State; Capitalist Class; Crises of Capitalism; Open Marxism

151. Cloward, Richard A.

Richard A. Cloward was a towering figure in three different disciplines: social work, sociology/criminology, and political science. He was born in Rochester, New York on December 25, 1926, and died in New York City on August 20, 2001. Cloward obtained an M.S.W. from the Columbia University School of Social Work and a Ph.D. from Columbia University's sociology program. He eventually joined the faculty at the Columbia University School of Social Work and ended up serving as a professor there for over 40 years. Although trained as a social worker and sociologist, Cloward, along with his long-time partner and collaborator Frances Fox Piven, made major contributions to critical political science. This was accomplished in two major publications.

In *Regulating the Poor* (1993), Piven and Cloward challenged the commonly accepted view that the introduction or expansion of social welfare programs is due to the beneficence of public officials. This view claimed that when public officials notice that massive numbers of people are in need they respond by creating new social welfare program or by expanding already existing social welfare programs. Cloward claimed that need tends to be ubiquitous, yet public officials typically go for very long periods without doing much to respond to it. What gets them to respond, when they do, is the following chain of events.

Economic dislocations, such as recessions/depressions and mechanization result in massive unemployment. Once people become unemployed, their behavior is less governed by the norms of the workplace, which previously held them in check. This increases the likelihood that they will break rules, whether in the form of increased "street crime" or disruptive social protests. Public authorities could respond to this type of social unrest by repressing it, and Cloward contended that history provides many examples of such repression. But there are times when public figures decide, in an effort to calm things down, that it is in their interest to offer concessions to the poor and unemployed. These concessions take the form of new social welfare programs or expansions of already existing ones.

Once social unrest subsides, Cloward contended, public officials typically engage in "welfare reform." Although referred to as "reform," these efforts are really intended to reduce the number of social welfare program beneficiaries or deter those who are eligible for benefits from applying for them. Cloward claimed that this deterrence involved punishing or degrading "able-bodied" recipients of social welfare benefits. The main targets of such punishment and degradation, however, are not welfare recipients, but those who are eligible to receive welfare benefits and are not currently receiving them. The hope is that the degrading treatment of welfare recipients will result in these eligible non-recipients preferring work in any job at any wage to receiving welfare.

Cloward and Piven addressed similar themes in *Poor People's Movements* (1977). This work dealt with the following question: how are poor people most likely to get public officials to enact policies which address their interests? At the time *Poor People's Movements* was written, one popular view was that poor people needed to organize; that is, they needed to focus on building formal organizations which would be able to contend with the powers that be, pressuring them to enact laws to benefit those at the bottom of the socioeconomic system. This could be called "the union model" of collective action.

Just as unions build labor market power by focusing on increasing the number of dues paying members, poor people, in order to build community power, should focus on building organizations of dues paying poor folks. In *Poor People's Movements*, Cloward challenged this common view. By definition, poor people do not have much money, so it is hard to charge them enough dues to sustain a mass organization. Also, unlike unions which, by law, can, in some cases, require workers to join them, poor people's organizations cannot require membership. Instead of making change through organizing, Cloward contended that poor people have been most successful at achieving social change through mobilizing their capacity to disrupt social systems.

Disruption involves the strategic violation of laws or other kinds of social norms, which make it difficult for institutions to function normally. This disruption sometimes results in public officials enacting policies which serve the needs of poor people, not because

they care much about such people but in order to end their politically costly disruption. Drawing on U.S. case studies involving the early twentieth century protests of unemployed workers, organized labor, the Civil Rights Movement, and the Welfare Rights Movement, Cloward makes the case that if poor people want to see any kind of social change in their favor, they are most likely to do so if they focus on mobilizing rather than organizing.

Not only did Cloward study activism, but he also took part in it. For example, instead of merely writing about the welfare rights movement, along with women such as Johnnie Tillmon (Germain 2021) he was a key player in it. Many recipients of welfare at the time were not receiving all the benefits they were entitled to receive. One goal of the welfare rights movement was, through disruptive social protests, to get state and local officials to provide these benefits. But the ultimate goal of the movement was to get the

U.S. federal government to federalize welfare benefits in the form of a guaranteed income.

Some of us in the social sciences try to combine academic careers with activism. Cloward did this better than many. He did it in a world which was, in many ways, different from ours. But the injustices he faced during his time are similar enough to those we currently face that he remains a standard bearer for those of us who want to pursue this course of action.

MICHAEL ANTHONY LEWIS

References

- Germain, Jacqui. 2021. The National Welfare Rights Organization Wanted Economic Justice for Black Americans, www.teenvogue.com/story/national-welfare-rights-organization-black-women.
- Piven, Frances Fox and Richard A. Cloward. 1971. *Regulating the Poor: The Functions of Public Welfare*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Piven, Frances Fox and Richard A. Cloward. 1977. *Poor People's Movements: Why they Succeed, How they Fail*. New York: Vintage Books.

152. Connolly, William E.

William E. Connolly (b. 1938, Flint, Michigan) is the Krieger-Eisenhower Professor in the Department of Political Science at Johns Hopkins University (since 1985), after previously holding positions at Ohio University (1965–68) and the University of Massachusetts, Amherst (1968–85). Connolly is generally considered one of the most important political theorists writing in English today, as he was ranked fourth most influential political theorist in a poll of political scientists in 2010 after Michel Foucault, John Rawls, and Jürgen Habermas (Moore 2010).

More importantly, Connolly has been a consistent practitioner of critical political science, if we mean by this orientation the constant and unerring critique of the conditions of social and political life with a concomitant articulation of possible goals and ideas for social transformation toward deeper forms of pluralism, democracy, and equality. Connolly's enactment of critical political science has not stayed the same over the years and has taken on different metatheoretical orientations and substantive foci throughout his long career, moving from an early commitment to democratic socialism influenced by Marx's early works to a Left Nietzschean position tied to identity/difference in the context of rising new social movements to an anti-capitalist "new materialist" position that sees the imbricated pluripotentiality of human and non-human agents under the increasing catastrophe of global climate change. Connolly's *oeuvre* illustrates the rich potentiality of – and diverse approaches to – critical political science.

Connolly's early work ran parallel to the development of critical political science in the late sixties and early seventies, when there was an avid critique of the dominance of behavioralism, a concomitant rethinking of a vapid notion of pluralism then circulating in the American context, and a deep commitment to political transformations in line with global demands for radical change that characterized the "long decade" of the sixties. In this respect, he was a fellow traveler of the new Caucus for a New Political Science (CNPS), and actually ran on the Caucus ticket for a seat on the American Political Science Association (APSA) Council in 1969,

though, as he noted in a recent reflection, he was unsuccessful as were other members of the Caucus in gaining access to seats of power within APSA. Eventually, Connolly would side with the faction of the Caucus that thought it best to avoid working within the national organization of APSA and instead "create an independent association to support scholars who combine activism, teaching, and political research. Such a combination would allow us to test through live experiments the positive possibilities residing in the regime, rather than limiting our 'tests' onto actualities already in play" (Connolly and Macdonald 2015, 261). Connolly's first book, *Political Science and Ideology* (1967), and his early edited volume, *The Bias of Pluralism* (1969), clearly show his commitment to the general critiques and engagements of CNPS and other proponents of critical political science at this time. This stage of his theoretical development would culminate in the co-authored (with Michael Best) book, *The Politicized Economy* (1976). In this work, Connolly and Best would resolutely argue for a vision of democratic socialism inspired by the early work of Marx, while criticizing the role of corporate capitalism in exacerbating income and wealth disparities. Connolly and Best observed that contemporary capitalism was also creating ecological challenges and dislocations at alarming rates, and even with the existence of a welfare state, capitalism was engendering forms of de-democratization and injustice in the advanced capitalist societies. Of particular note, Connolly and Best warned of the growing resentment of the traditional white working class if the Left did not attend to class-based issues and concerns, while also supporting important progressive discourses related to race, gender, and sexuality.

With the rise of French Theory in the late 1970s and 1980s, and the proliferation of new social movements that were contesting entrenched political notions and expanding discourses of democracy, equality, and freedom, Connolly's work began to reflect these developments while also retaining his early commitments. Drawing upon the work of Friedrich Nietzsche, Michel Foucault, Gilles Deleuze, and others, Connolly began to interrogate the diverse pathways to the articulation of identities, while arguing for a notion of deep or radical pluralism. In *The Ethos of Pluralization* (1995, xv), Connolly calls for cultivating "an ethos of critical respon-

siveness to political movements” which would “translate the pluralist appreciation of established diversity into active cultivation of generosity to contemporary movements of pluralization.” In a sense, Connolly continued his critique of the limits of mainstream pluralism articulated in the early period of his thinking but he now offered a positive portrayal of “a generous ethos of multidimensional pluralism [that] sets a key condition of possibility for the reduction of economic inequality” (Connolly and Macdonald 2002, 176).

With the publication of *Capitalism and Christianity, American Style* (2008), Connolly returned to a direct critique of capitalism – what he terms the “the evangelical-capitalist resonance machine” – and argued for an “eco-egalitarian” interim radical vision that can attend to a deepening of vibrant pluralization, economic equality, and ecological sanity. With the recent publication of *The Fragility of Things* (2011), and particularly, *Facing the Planetary* (2017), Connolly has articulated an ontopolitical picture in which human and non-human forces are part of a complex relay assemblage that, in the context of the rise of the capitalist Anthropocene, has generated devastating ecological consequences. Refusing to take the stance of “passive nihilism,” Connolly (2017a, 125) advocates for a militant political strategy that works on both micro- and macropolitical levels – a “politics of swarming” which engages “multiple constituencies, regions, levels, processes of communication, and modes of action.” Moreover, in the face of the rising threats of authoritarianism and “aspirational fascism” in the United States, Connolly (2017b, 106) has advocated the nourishing of a rich ethos of “multifaceted pluralism,” with a deep commitment to “reducing significantly class

inequalities of income, job security, educational opportunity, retirement prospects, wealth, and conditions of work.”

BRADLEY J. MACDONALD

References

- Connolly, William. 1967. *Political Science and Ideology*. New York: Atherton Press.
- Connolly, William, ed. 1969. *The Bias of Pluralism*. New York: Atherton Press.
- Connolly, William. 1995. *The Ethos of Pluralization*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Connolly, William. 2008. *Capitalism and Christianity, American Style*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Connolly, William. 2011. *The Fragility of Things: Self-Organizing Processes, Neoliberal Fantasies, and Democratic Activism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Connolly, William. 2017a. *Facing the Planetary: Entangled Humanism and the Politics of Swarming*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Connolly, William. 2017b. *Aspirational Fascism: The Struggle for Multifaceted Democracy under Trumpism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Connolly, William and Michael Best. 1976. *The Politicized Economy*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Connolly, William and Bradley Macdonald. 2002. “Towards an Ethos of Freedom and Engagement: An Interview with William E. Connolly.” *Strategies: Journal of Theory, Culture & Politics* 15, no. 2: 165–80.
- Connolly, William and Bradley Macdonald. 2015. “Confronting the Anthropocene and Contesting Neoliberalism: An Interview with William E. Connolly.” *New Political Science: A Journal of Politics & Culture* 37, no. 2: 259–75.
- Moore, Mathew. 2010. “Political Theory Today: Results of a National Survey.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 22, no. 2: 265–72.

153. Davis, Angela Y.

Angela Y. Davis (b. January 26, 1944–) is a Professor Emerita in the History of Consciousness at the University of California, Santa Cruz (1991–2008). She previously held academic appointments at San Francisco State University (1980–84) and Vassar College (1995). She is arguably one of the most prominent critical political scientists who has never identified or worked as an academic political scientist. Davis earned a B.A. in Philosophy at Brandeis University (1965), where she was a student of Herbert Marcuse. After studying at the University of Frankfurt for two years, she followed Marcuse to the University of California, San Diego, where she earned an M.A. in Philosophy (1968). She received her Ph.D. in Philosophy from Humboldt University in East Berlin.

Davis has been a recognized public intellectual and far-left radical for decades. She has been a member of the German Socialist Student Union (1965–67), an affiliate of the Black Panther Party, and a member of the Communist Party USA, which led the University of California Board of Regents to remove Davis from her first academic position at the University of California Los Angeles (1969–70). Despite holding academic positions, Davis has focused much of her life on political activism and prison reform, while publishing a range of widely successful books. One of the more noteworthy aspects of Davis's career is that Davis has published very few conventional academic books or peer-reviewed articles in scholarly journals (although many of her essays and interviews have been published and republished in academic journals). This observation is meant to convey that Davis's success proves how one can contribute positively to radical social change and have a long career, albeit not without facing formidable political attacks and struggles against entrenched power, and without debasing oneself to the cookie-cutter standards of conventional mainstream academic publications. In fact, her work is widely cited by academics across a range of disciplines.

It is hard to categorize Davis in terms of political science subfields, but political theory, public policy, and social movements are her main focus, and the fact that she is difficult to pigeonhole is perhaps what

makes her an example of what it means to be a critical political scientist – and a scholar-teacher-activist – because critical political science is definitionally far less concerned with academic labels than with contributing to the democratic and egalitarian transformation of our politics, economics, and cultures. With that as a standard, Angela Y. Davis is the epitome of critical political science – and she has the scars to prove it.

Davis's first major monograph – excluding *If They Come in the Morning ...* (1971 [2016]), which she only edited – was an autobiography originally published in 1974. Davis wrote and published her story in the wake of her firing from UCLA in 1969, her subsequent reinstatement, and second firing in 1970, followed by the FBI putting her on the Ten Most Wanted list due to her support of the “Soledad Brothers.” She was arrested, imprisoned, and eventually acquitted in 1972. Davis's (1974) autobiography covers her early life, time in college and graduate school, her time spent studying under Frankfurt School Critical Theorist Herbert Marcuse, although she worked and interacted with many prominent scholars in Germany, including Theodor Adorno, with whom she had sharp disagreements over the proper relationship between scholars and activism. Much of her autobiography explores her relationship to the criminal (in)justice system, including her time spent incarcerated. This experience initiated Davis's lifelong exploration and radical critique of what she and Mike Davis (2003) call the “prison-industrial complex.” While not a conventional scholarly text, Davis's autobiography is the pinnacle of a form that exceeds in depth and political impact the autobiographies of figures such as St. Augustine (1983), John Stuart Mill (2022), Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1945), and even Alex Haley's quasi-autobiography of Malcolm X (1965). Though Davis's work predates the term, in many ways her autobiography is much more of an autoethnography than a traditional autobiography, which makes it an underappreciated *methodological* contribution to the critical study of politics (Chang 2008; Sikes 2013). It is an autoethnography of the prison-industrial complex, but it also explores what it means to be a radical academic, who is also a Black, queer, communist in the mid-to-late twentieth century.

Other than her autobiography, Davis's most important early work is *Women, Race & Class* (1981). Among its many intellectual contributions, Davis highlights overlooked working-class women at a time before the supposed "entry" of women in the workforce in the mid-twentieth century. Davis shows how women of color, typically poor (or enslaved) have always worked and worked outside their home if they had one. Women, especially poor women of color, have historically worked both inside and outside the home, including in factories and mines. *Women, Race, & Class* also explores the complexities and contradictions of the suffrage movement in relation to the abolitionist movement, where women also played a major role. Davis also discusses the role of women, including women of color, in the labor and communist movements in the early 1900s. If all that were not important and controversial enough, the book offers a vicious but well-researched and well-argued critique of the myth of the Black male rapist. Davis never shies away from emphasizing historical examples of men and women working in solidarity in these struggles, including solidarity between white people and people of color. Davis's work shows the difficulties, but additionally the enormous value of solidarity in transformative political movements, particularly when an exploitative capitalist political economy underlies, implicitly or explicitly, the oppressions being struggled against by ordinary people. Building on the arguments made in *Women, Race, & Class*, the essays in Davis's (1984) *Women, Culture, & Politics* adds a detailed critique of the feminization of poverty as an actual reality and in political discourse.

The next stage of Davis's writing and activism centered on prison abolition and culminated in the short but punchy collection, entitled *Are Prisons Obsolete?* (2003). Her conclusion, which she defends with ample and diverse evidence is that prisons are obsolete. According to Davis, prisons are obsolete because there is no evidence that they reduce crime, but prisons are enormously expensive, and they are racist and sexist in their impact on society. Thus, there is no reason to believe that prisons serve any productive purpose in society. One of the subtle but nonetheless important moments in this book is the connection Davis shows between the logics and material political economy

of the prison-industrial complex and the military-industrial complex.

The connection between domestic and global politics (i.e., U.S. foreign policy) is something that Davis also frequently emphasizes in her work. In Davis's (2005) *Abolition Democracy: Beyond Empire, Prisons, and Torture*, she builds on her lifelong engagement with the work of W.E.B. DuBois, while offering strident critiques of the prison system, the permanent war economy, and the torture regime that emerged in the wake of September 11, 2001. More recently, Davis has written passionately about the Black Lives Matter movement (BLM) as she continues to criticize prisons and policing in the United States. In *Freedom is a Constant Struggle: Ferguson, Palestine, and the Foundations of a Movement*, Davis (2016) discusses her support for the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Against Israel (BDS) movement, as well as her support for the Palestinian cause more generally. A particularly interesting anecdote in this book is how Palestinian activists helped educate BLM protesters about how to counter the tear gas being used against them. Not only was this relationship an example of transnational solidarity; it revealed that the Palestinians were familiar with the *exact* tear gas canisters being used against BLM, because they were the exact same ones used by Israel against Palestinian freedom fighters. Davis uses this example to illustrate the broader connection between domestic oppression within the U.S. and the global violence perpetuated by the U.S. and its allies.

Angela Y. Davis should be a role model for all critical academics and critical political scientists in particular.

BRYANT WILLIAM SCULOS

References

- Chang, Heewong. 2008. *Autoethnography as Method*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Davis, Angela Y., ed. 1971 [2016]. *If They Come in the Morning ... Voices of Resistance*. New York: Verso Books.
- Davis, Angela Y. 1974. *Angela Davis: An Autobiography*. New York: International Publishers.
- Davis, Angela Y. 1981. *Women, Race, & Class*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Davis, Angela Y. 1984. *Women, Culture, & Politics*. New York: Vintage Books.

- Davis, Angela Y. 2003. *Are Prisons Obsolete?* New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Davis, Angela Y. 2005. *Abolition Democracy: Beyond Empire, Prisons, and Torture*. New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Davis, Angela Y. 2016. *Freedom is a Constant Struggle: Ferguson, Palestine, and the Foundations of a Movement*. Chicago: Haymarket Books.
- Malcolm X. 1965. *The Autobiography of Malcolm X*, with the assistance of Alex Haley. Introduction by M.S. Handler. Epilogue by Alex Haley. New York: Grove Press.
- Mill, John Stuart. 2022 [1873]. *Autobiography*. Garden City, N.Y.: Dover Publications.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. 1945 [1782–89]. *The Confessions of Jean-Jacques Rousseau*. New York: Modern Library.
- St. Augustine of Hippo. 1983. [397 BCE]. *Confessions*, a new translation with introductions by E.M. Blaiklock. Nashville: T. Nelson.
- Sikes, Pat, ed. 2013. *Autoethnography*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Further readings

- Gilmore, Ruth Wilson. 2022. *Abolition Geography: Essays Toward Liberation*. New York: Verso Books.
- Hill, Marc Lamont. 2020. *We Still Here: Pandemic, Policing, Protest, & Possibility*. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books.
- Johnson, Gaye Theresa and Alex Lubin. 2017. *Futures of Black Radicalism*. New York: Verso Books.
- Taylor, Keeanga-Yamahтта. 2016. *From #BlackLivesMatter to Black Liberation*. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books.
- Taylor, Keeanga-Yamahтта (ed.). 2017. *How We Get Free: Black Feminism and the Combahee River Collective*. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books.
- West, Cornel. 2004. *Democracy Matters: Winning the Fight Against Imperialism*. New York: The Penguin Press.
- Young, Cynthia A. 2006. *Soul Power: Culture, Radicalism, and the Making of a U.S. Third World Left*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

154. Debord, Guy

Guy-Ernest Debord (b. 1931 in Paris, d. 1994 in Bellevue-la-Montagne), was a filmmaker, a philosopher, and a founder of the Situationist International in 1957. Debord began studying law in Paris, but he decided soon to drop out of university and instead became involved in the avant-garde arts and culture Letterist movement.

Debord is best known for his seminal book *The Society of the Spectacle* (*La société du spectacle*) (1967). The book can be considered seminal in relation to the Situationist movement, to Marxist theory, to Media studies, to Urban studies, to critical theory, and to many other related fields. Moreover, the book significantly influenced the events of France May 1968 (Jappe 1999, 99–104). In 1988, Debord published his *Comments on the Society of the Spectacle* in order to react to, and discuss, some of the critiques of his main work. The *Society of the Spectacle* is divided into nine chapters and 211 theses. In this book, Debord developed his critical theory through the concept of *spectacle*. He describes the capitalist mode of production as “an immense accumulation of *spectacles*” (SS, § 1), in which “[t]he spectacle is not a collection of images; it is a social relation between people that is mediated by images” (SS, § 4). The concept of spectacle, which is therefore the very core of the capitalist mode of production, is neither an “excess produced by media technologies” (SS, § 5), nor to be confused with “media” as a mere “instrument” (Debord 1990, 6), but instead it is “the result and the project” (SS, § 6) of the capitalist mode of production or a phenomenon which involves the entire society (Debord 1990, 7). The spectacle confers unity to the reified, atomized individuals by justifying the existing society. Therefore, the concept of spectacle is strictly indebted to Marx’s critique of commodity-form and commodity-fetishism, as well as to Lukács’ concept of reification (Jappe 1999, 19ff.).

In the *Society of the Spectacle*, some concepts developed within the Letterist and the Situationist International (an avantgarde and political movement inspired by libertarian Marxism), such as the “*détournement*”, “psychogeography” or the “science of situations”,

echo as strategies that can allow an overcoming of the alienation of the spectacle. In the first case, the *détournement* refers to a quotation that is re-employed in another context, or modified accordingly, in order to get or give a new meaning (Jappe 1999, 59ff.), or a resemantization or resignification of pre-existing elements (Perniola 2013). In the second case, psychogeography is intended as “the study of the specific effects of the geographical environment (whether consciously organized or not) on the emotions and behaviour of individuals” (Situationist International 2006, 52). Moreover, the aim of the Situationist International was to create situations or “moments of lived time that would unify art and life, through being shaped and lived according to the experiencing subjects’ own wishes” (Bunyard 2018, 27). Another important element to be mentioned of the Situationist Movement was the idea of the supersession of art; that is, the overcoming of the divide between art and life, which would coincide with the overcoming of the capitalist mode of production and of bourgeois art.

GABRIELE SCHIMMENTI

References

- Bunyard, Tom. 2018. *Debord, Time and Spectacle. Hegelian Marxism and Situationist Theory*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Debord, Guy. 1990. *Comments on the Society of the Spectacle*, translated by Malcolm Imrie. London and New York: Verso.
- Debord, Guy. 2014. *The Society of the Spectacle*, translated and annotated by Ken Knabb. Berkeley: Bureau of Public Secrets.
- Jappe, Anselm. 1999. *Guy Debord*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Merrifield, Andy. 2005. *Guy Debord*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Perniola, Mario. 2013. *L'avventura situazionista. Storia critica dell'ultima avanguardia del XX secolo*. Milano-Udine: Mimesis.
- Situationist International. 2006. *Situationist International Anthology*, translated and edited by Ken Knabb. Berkeley: Bureau of Public Secrets.

See also

Art as Critical Political Science; Critical Media Studies; Film Studies; Commodity Fetishism; Reification

155. Deleuze, Gilles

Gilles Deleuze (January 18, 1925–November 4, 1995) was a French philosopher. Deleuze (1980, ix) once described his most ambitious project – the two volumes of *Capitalism and Schizophrenia* co-written with Félix Guattari – as “philosophy, and nothing but philosophy.” This admission is hardened by Deleuze’s early career, where he produced a series of monographs on philosophical figures. All told, Deleuze would write critical studies on David Hume (1953), Friedrich Nietzsche (1962), Immanuel Kant (1963), Henri Bergson (1966), two books on Baruch Spinoza (1968, 1970), Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1988), and Michel Foucault (1986). His interest in the arts and literature found expression in studies of Marcel Proust (1964), Leopold von Sacher-Masoch (1967), Francis Bacon (1981), Franz Kafka (1975, co-written with Guattari), and a two-volume treatise on cinema (1983, 1985). These focused readings testify to Deleuze’s stature as an erudite scholar of the philosophical tradition, something he would return to in his final book written alongside Guattari, *What is Philosophy?* (1991).

Difference and Repetition would mark Deleuze’s (1968, xv) foray away from writing histories of philosophy and his first attempt to “do philosophy.” In this book, Deleuze spells out a differential ontology. He describes the history of philosophy as resting upon the primacy of identity and attacks it as such. Philosophy’s “image of thought” rests upon a metaphysics and epistemology of representation. In *The Logic of Sense* (1969), published a year later, Deleuze applied his theory of difference to the creation of meaning and the unfolding of events.

May 1968 proved a decisive event in the life of Deleuze; afterwards, his writing notably shifted towards political topics. Deleuze found himself a supporter of the street protests but nevertheless he remained a spectator. Thus, his meeting radical activist Félix Guattari was also a decisive event. Guattari put into practice what Deleuze spent his time contemplating. Guattari not only had experience on the streets, but also in the clinic. He directed an experimental asylum called *La Borde* where clinical practice was decided cooperatively. The first volume

of Deleuze and Guattari’s *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, *Anti-Oedipus* (1972), was a publication event, a shocking, experimental *tour de force* that attempted to put into words the revolutionary imaginations of the May 1968 protests. *Anti-Oedipus* caused a stir due to its irreverent and derisive tone. Reading it is an experience. The targets of Deleuze and Guattari’s ire was the Freudo-Marxism prevalent within French academia and society. The Oedipus Complex describes the unconscious as a “theatre of representation,” where composite subjects are held captive by their Mommy-Daddy issues, forever repressed, and ever in need of therapeutic cure. In contrast, Deleuze and Guattari turn to the schizophrenic as an incomprehensible subject, driven by complex unseen forces. For them, schizophrenia serves as a model for understanding the psychological micro-foundations that drive political ideologies, especially fascism and capitalism.

If *Anti-Oedipus* served as a manifesto for student militancy, their follow-up *A Thousand Plateaus* was a prelude to the triumph of global capitalism. Despite covering a hodgepodge of disparate topics, Deleuze and Guattari remained fixated upon the same political themes: fascism, capitalism, and pre-modern state formation. The opening chapter (called plateaus) “Rhizome” foreshadows all that follows. Using the image of rhizomatic root structures, they theorize social forces and political institutions as complex, dynamic, de-centered autonomous networks. Deleuze’s (1992) post-script upon politics, written shortly before his death, in the last decade of the twentieth century, heralded the emergence of more mobile and amorphous forms of social control.

Deleuze has been criticized for obscurantism, but also cited as the inspiration for assemblage theory and the new materialism. His most vocal critic Alain Badiou (1977) labeled him a fascist for his extreme anti-organizational politics. Slavoj Žižek (2004, 184) called Deleuze “the ideologist of late capitalism,” a common critique oft repeated by others. This was dramatically rendered by revelations that the Israel Defense Forces heavily relied upon Deleuze and Guattari to develop innovative military strategies. It is therefore worth concluding by acknowledging that their work also informed

the anti-globalization movement (Hardt and Negri 2000).

ANDREW JOHNSON

References

- Badiou, Alain. 1977 [2012]. "The Fascism of the Potato." *The Adventure of French Philosophy*, translated by Bruno Bosteels. London: Verso.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 1953 [1991]. *Empiricism and Subjectivity*, translated by Constantin Boundas. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 1962 [1983]. *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, translated by Hugh Tomlinson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 1963 [1984]. *The Critical Philosophy of Kant*, translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 1964 [2003]. *Proust and Signs*, translated by Richard Howard. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 1966 [1988]. *Bergsonism*, translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam. New York: Zone.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 1967 [1989]. *Masochism: An Interpretation of Coldness and Cruelty*, translated by Jean McNeil. New York: Zone.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 1968 [1994]. *Difference and Repetition*, translated by Paul Patton. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 1968 [1990]. *Expressionism in Philosophy: Spinoza*, translated by Martin Joughin. New York: Zone.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 1969 [1990]. *The Logic of Sense*, translated by Mark Lester with Charles Stivale. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 1970 [1988]. *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy*, translated Robert Hurley. San Francisco: City Lights.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 1981 [2005]. *Francis Bacon: Logic of Sensation*, translated by Daniel Smith. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 1983 [1986]. *Cinema I: The Movement-Image*, translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 1985 [1989]. *Cinema II: The Time-Image*, translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 1986 [1988]. *Foucault*, translated by Sean Hand. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 1988 [1993]. *The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque*, translated by Tom Conley. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. 1972 [1977]. *Anti-Oedipus*, translated by Robert Hurley, Mark Seem and Helen R. Lane. New York: Viking.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. 1975 [1986]. *Kafka: For a Minor Literature*, translated by Dana Polan. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. 1980 [1987]. *A Thousand Plateaus*, translated by Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. 1991 [1994]. *What is Philosophy?*, translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. 1992. "Postscript on the Societies of Control." *October* 59 (Winter): 3–7.
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2000. *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Weizman, Eyal. 2006. "Lethal Theory." *Log* no. 7 (Winter/Spring): 53–77.
- Žižek, Slavoj. 2004. *Organs Without Bodies: Deleuze and Consequences*. New York: Routledge.

Further readings

- Dosse, François. 2010. *Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari: Intersecting Lives*, translated by Deborah Glassman. New York: Columbia University Press.

See also

Guattari, Félix; Post-Structuralism

156. Domhoff, G. William

G. William Domhoff (b. August 6, 1936, Youngstown, Ohio) is a Distinguished Professor Emeritus of Psychology and Sociology at the University of California, Santa Cruz. He received a B.A. at Duke University (1958), an M.A. at Kent State University (1959), and his Ph.D. in Psychology at the University of Miami (1962). He taught at California State University, Los Angeles (1962–65) before joining the University of California, Santa Cruz (UCSC) in 1965 as an Assistant Professor and founding member of the Psychology Department. He was promoted to Distinguished Professor in 1993 and, in 2007, he received the University of California's Constantine Panunzio Distinguished Emeriti Award, which honors "outstanding scholarly work or educational service performed since retirement by an emeritus or emerita in the humanities or social sciences."

While Domhoff has made significant contributions to psychology in the area of dream research, he is best known for his work in sociology on the power structure of the United States. Four of his books were among the top 50 best sellers in sociology for the years 1950 to 1995: *Who Rules America?* (1967, #12); *The Higher Circles* (1970, #39); *The Powers That Be* (1979, #47); and *Who Rules America Now?* (1983, #43). Domhoff's first book, *Who Rules America?*, was a landmark analysis of the American power structure that has been republished eight editions as of 2022, while stimulating research and debate for more than half a century. *Who Rules America?* challenged the conventional "pluralist" account of the distribution and exercise of power in American politics that dominated American political science at the time. Domhoff demonstrated the close connections between a wealthy social upper class, ownership of the major banks and corporations that dominate the American economy, control over key institutions that shape public opinion and public policy, control of the executive branch of the federal government, and deep influence over the federal legislative branch, as well as state and local governments. Domhoff (1967, 9) borrowed and modified the concept of a "power elite" from C. Wright Mills, which he defines

as "the operating arm of the American upper (governing) class."

In an important chapter in *Who Rules America?* on "the shaping of the American polity," Domhoff (1967, 64) examined how four types of institutions – foundations, associations, universities, and the mass media – "are closely intertwined with each other and the corporate economy." He argues that "associations," which he later called Policy Planning Organizations (PPOs) include important institutions such as the Council on Foreign Relations, the Committee for Economic Development, and the Business Advisory Council. In a later book, *The Powers That Be* (1979), Domhoff analyses the role of "associations" in the U.S. policy-formation process and identifies their operations as one of four major processes of ruling class domination in America. The other processes of ruling class domination are the special-interest process (lobbying), the candidate-selection process (political parties and campaign finance), and the ideology-process (education, mass media, campaigns), which he later called the opinion-shaping process (Domhoff 1979). Domhoff shows how the power elite operates to formulate policy on larger issues through a policy-planning network that integrates these four processes to facilitate the political, economic, and ideological domination of a capitalist ruling class in the United States.

In the most recent edition of *Who Rules America?*, Domhoff updates his analysis of the key foundations, think tanks, and policy planning organizations that comprise the policy-planning network in the twenty-first century. The leading PPOs now consist of the Business Roundtable, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Business Council, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Domhoff notes that the policy planning network is not homogenous, a point he made in *Who Rules America?*, because there is an "ultra-conservative" wing of the ruling class represented in organizations such as the American Enterprise Institute, the Heritage Foundation, and the Federalist Society (Domhoff 2022, Chap. 4). More broadly, Domhoff observes that by 2020 strains were emerging in the dominant corporate-conservative coalition as ultraconservative white nationalists became critical of the political stands of prominent corporate leaders.

Domhoff has influenced the development of critical political science in several ways. First, his analysis of power directly challenged the dominant pluralist paradigm developed by Robert A. Dahl and other mainstream political scientists. Second, his work influenced a new wave of scholarship in political science in the 1970s, including American politics textbooks from radical perspectives by Kenneth Dolbeare and Murray Edelman (1971), Michael Parenti (1974), Mark Kesselman and Ira Katznelson (1975), and Edward S. Greenberg (1977). Third, Domhoff's ideas entered into debates over theories of the state on the part of Marxists and other radicals in the 1970s, often cast in terms of competing schools of "structuralists" and "instrumentalists." Domhoff rejected being labelled an instrumentalist, because he acknowledged that the corporate community had important structural power derived from the functioning of the capitalist economy, which is independent of its attempts to influence government directly. However, structural power, in his view, was insufficient to ensure that the corporate community dominated the federal government. Thus, it was necessary to examine the specific processes by which the ruling class rules and fends off challenges from the working class and other popular political movements. Fourth, starting in the 1980s, Domhoff produced a series of detailed historical case studies of American politics and public policy formation that criticized the emerging state-centric or historical institutionalist school in political science as being insufficiently attentive to class forces and for overstating the independence of experts and political entrepreneurs. Fifth, corporate dominance theories, such as Domhoff's, have to some extent informed recent work on inequality, power, and American politics by prominent mainstream political scientists, including Larry Bartels (2008), Jacob Hacker and Paul Pierson (2010), and Martin Gilens and Benjamin Page (2014), whose research clearly challenges pluralist assumptions about the equal distribution of political power in the United States. Finally, Domhoff has articulated his views about what strategies

and approaches might be most plausible for an inclusive coalition on the left that could effectively challenge the powers that be (Domhoff 2003).

JOSEPH G. PESCHEK

References

- Bartels, Larry. 2008. *Unequal Democracy: The Political Economy of the New Gilded Age*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Dolbeare, Kenneth, and Murray Edelman. 1971. *American Politics: Power, Politics, and Change*. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.
- Domhoff, G. William. 1967. *Who Rules America?* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Domhoff, G. William. 1979. *The Powers That Be: Processes of Ruling Class Domination in America*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Domhoff, G. William. 2003. *Changing the Powers That Be: How the Left Can Stop Losing and Win*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Domhoff, G. William, and Eleven Other Authors. 2018. *Studying the Power Elite: Fifty Years of Who Rules America?* New York and London: Routledge.
- Domhoff, G. William. 2022. *Who Rules America? The Corporate Rich, White Nationalist Republicans, and Inclusionary Democrats in the 2020s*, 8th edn. New York and London: Routledge.
- Gilens, Martin, and Benjamin I. Page. 2014. "Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens." *Perspectives on Politics* 27: 564–81.
- Greenberg, Edward S. 1977. *The American Political System: A Radical Approach*. New York: Winthrop Publishers.
- Hacker, Jacob S., and Paul Pierson. 2010. *Winner-Take-All Politics: How Washington Made the Rich Richer – And Turned Its Back on the Middle Class*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Kesselman, Mark, and Ira Katznelson. 1975. *The Politics of Power: A Critical Introduction to American Government*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Parenti, Michael. 1974. *Democracy for the Few*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

See also

Ralph Miliband; C. Wright Mills; Policy-Planning Organizations; Power; Power Structure Analysis

157. Du Bois, W.E.B.

William Edward Burghart “W.E.B.” Du Bois (February 23, 1868–August 27, 1963) was born to a middle-class, African American family in Great Barrington, Massachusetts. He obtained bachelors’ degrees from Fisk University, a historically Black college in Tennessee, and Harvard University. On an award from the John F. Slater Fund for the Education of Freedmen, he studied at Friedrich Wilhelm University in Berlin, where he encountered Max Weber and completed a thesis under the supervision of Adolph Wagner and Gustav von Schmoller of the German Historical School. Upon returning to the United States, he completed his dissertation ([1896] 2007) in History at Harvard University, becoming the first Black person to receive a Ph.D. from the institution.

Du Bois devoted his life to scholarship and activism in the service of Black liberation. He taught at the historically Black Wilberforce University, the University of Pennsylvania, and Atlanta University, the historically Black institution where he spent the majority of his academic career. He also played a leading role in the foundation and development of the Niagara Movement, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the Pan-Africanist movement. On Kwame Nkrumah’s invitation, Du Bois emigrated to Accra, Ghana, in 1961, where he became a citizen and lived until his death in 1963.

Du Bois’ influence on the discipline of political science has been monumental. Consistently defying contemporary disciplinary boundaries, his writings range freely across the genres of sociology, philosophy, history, fiction, aesthetic criticism, and autobiography. His work has shaped the methods we use, questions we ask, and categories we deploy when studying race, class, and democracy within and beyond the U.S. today. Du Bois is especially known for establishing several distinct approaches to the study of race. His essay “The Conservation of the Races” ([1897] 2015) remains at the center of theoretical debates interrogating the biological and social dimensions of race. While at Atlanta University, Du Bois published *The Philadelphia Negro* (1899), a land-mark empirical study of Black life in Philadelphia’s Seventh Ward, edited the University’s journal, *Atlanta University Studies* (1898–1914), and

developed its sociology department into the first scientific school of American sociology. These endeavors pioneered the application of quantitative methods to the study of race, thereby contributing to the emergence of modern social science as an empirical field oriented toward the development of social policy.

Du Bois’ scholarship is also foundational for the study of African American politics. In *The Souls of Black Folk* ([1903] 2007), Du Bois’ most influential work, he sets forth what would become his most famous concept, “double consciousness,” to theorize the lived experiences and what he called the “spiritual strivings” of Black Americans in the white supremacist U.S. The book also offers a theory of Black politics aimed at the destruction of the Jim Crow system. Against Booker T. Washington, it advocates for the universal integration of Black Americans into U.S. society through socio-economic, cultural, and political uplift executed in concert with an explicit assault on anti-Black prejudice. Further, the book takes inspiration from Frederick Douglass and Alexander Crummell to advance a controversial theory of Black liberation through Black elite leadership, the so-called “Talented Tenth” of the Black population.

Du Bois’ work has also been seminal for contemporary scholarship on “whiteness” ([1920] 2007; [1935] 2007). In particular, Du Bois stresses the political-economic foundations of white identity. For instance, he argues that the global origins of whiteness lie in European imperialism, colonization, slavery, and the slave trade ([1920] 2007). In his landmark contribution to U.S. history, *Black Reconstruction in America, 1868–1880*, he applies a Marxist framework to theorize the genesis and persistence of white supremacy and anti-Black racism in the U.S. He argues that U.S. capitalism enforces whiteness by conferring a “public and psychological wage” – that is, psychic and material gratifications – upon white capitalists and workers ([1935] 2007).

Today, the enduring value of Du Bois’ work for political science is its elucidation of the nature of white supremacy as a global phenomenon and theorization of democracy as a strategy for the liberation of Black people, people of color, and workers. Through the concept of a global “color line,” Du Bois theorizes the hierarchical stratification of

racialized groups, and the skewed distribution of socio-economic, cultural, and political opportunities to white peoples in the U.S. and Europe ([1900a] 2022; [1900b] 2022; [1903] 2007; [1925] 2022). He advocates, instead, for solidarity amongst people of color and “industrial democracy,” a form of society characterized by common ownership over the means of production and collective self-rule ([1925] 2022; [1935] 2007; [1947] 2022).

LUCIEN FERGUSON

References

- Du Bois, W.E.B. 2007. [1896]. *The Suppression of the African Slave Trade to the United States of America: 1638–1870*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Du Bois, W.E.B. 2015 [1897]. “The Conservation of Races.” In *The Problem of the Color Line At the Turn of the Twentieth Century: The Essential Early Essays*, edited by Nahum Dimitri Chandler, 51–65. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Du Bois, W.E.B. 2022. [1900a]. “The Present Outlook for the Dark Races of Mankind.” In *W.E.B. Du Bois: International Thought*, edited by Adom Getachew and Jennifer Pitts, 1–17. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Du Bois, W.E.B. 2022 [1900b]. “To the Nations of the World.” In *W.E.B. Du Bois: International Thought*, edited by Adom Getachew and Jennifer Pitts, 18–21. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Du Bois, W.E.B. 2007 [1903]. *The Souls of Black Folk*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Du Bois, W.E.B. 2007 [1920]. *Darkwater: Voices from within the Veil*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Du Bois, W.E.B. 2022 [1925]. “Worlds of Color.” In *W.E.B. Du Bois: International Thought*, edited by Adom Getachew and Jennifer Pitts, 66–90. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Du Bois, W.E.B. 2007 [1935]. *Black Reconstruction in America, 1860–1880*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Du Bois, W.E.B. 2022 [1947]. “An Appeal to the World: A Statement of Denial of Human Rights to Minorities, ‘Introduction’ (1947).” In *W.E.B. Du Bois: International Thought*, edited by Adom Getachew and Jennifer Pitts, 229–49. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

See also

Black Marxism; Critical Race Theory; Ethnicity; Racialization

158. Ehrenberg, John

John Ehrenberg (b. October 2, 1944) was raised in New York after World War II. He attended Dartmouth College in the early 1960s and received his bachelor's degree in 1965. Ehrenberg received his Ph.D. in Political Science from Stanford University, which he began attending just as the Civil Rights and Antiwar Movements were beginning to transform American higher education. The academic environment in Stanford's Political Science Department became one of open contestation as many graduate students demanded that the discipline as a whole reorient its focus from study of the status quo to a more active critique of power, ideology, history, and institutions. Since many of the Political Science Department's faculty members – Gabriel Almond, Sidney Verba, Heinz Eulau, and others – were recognized as national leaders of the discipline, these pressures took on added weight that rippled through the discipline. From 1972 to 1977, Ehrenberg was an Assistant Professor of Political Science at University of New Mexico. He was an assistant professor at St. John's University from 1977 to 1980. He moved to Long Island University, where he was an Associate Professor (1980–85) and Professor since 1985.

Ehrenberg was an active participant in this democratic upsurge as he joined thousands of fellow students in demonstrations, sit-ins, petitions, and other forms of political engagement. He soon became one of the early members of the Caucus for a New Political Science and worked to legitimize leftist scholarship and activism in the publications, conventions, and everyday work of the American Political Science Association. His own scholarship and activism reflected the new orientation of many younger members of the discipline. Yearly contributions to APSA conventions were supplemented by books and articles that deepened his critique of American politics and society. In an early book, *The Dictatorship of the Proletariat: Marxism's Theory of Socialist Democracy* (1992), Ehrenberg responded to persistent student questions about whether Marxism could possibly be construed as a democratic political theory.

More recently, Ehrenberg has analysed the political impact of accelerating economic inequality in the United States in his book *Servants of Wealth: The Right's Assault on Economic Justice* (2006). This critique was expanded in his examination of the Bush Administration's rush to war in *The Iraq Papers* (2010), which was jointly written with three of his Long Island University departmental colleagues. Ehrenberg's focus on the development and trajectory of the contemporary American right continued with the publication of *White Nationalism and the Republican Party* (2022), an examination of how and why the GOP has moved from its traditional racial conservatism to an open embrace of white nationalism. These books were supplemented by articles in scholarly journals and multiple presentations at national and international conferences, which sought to deepen the ongoing critique of organized political science and to reorient scholarly work toward a critique of American society.

Ehrenberg has supplemented his scholarly work with organizational activity that has tracked the ebbs and flows of progressive critiques of academia. He served in a number of capacities in the Caucus for a New Political Science and with *New Political Science*, the organization's flagship journal. From *Science & Society* to Palgrave Communication's critique of Occupy Wall Street's hostility to ongoing political activity, he has consistently argued for direct engagement with structures of power and ideologies of privilege. This focus has led him to insist on the centrality of state power and political activity at a time when many of his peers and contemporaries began to flirt with postmodernism, identity politics, and various forms of anarchism or the hopes that mediating institutions of "civil society" should replace the left's historical emphasis on ideology and broad political struggles for state power. His book *Civil Society: The Critical History of an Idea* has been published in two editions and argues that there is no substitute for the comprehensiveness and breadth of organized political activity. Even as he has been part of a new wave of left-wing scholar-activists, Ehrenberg has argued that the insights of classical socialist theory and practice are indispensable to the future of a healthy, powerful, and politically relevant left.

JOHN EHRENBURG

References

- Ehrenberg, John. 1992. *The Dictatorship of the Proletariat: Marxism's Theory of Socialist Democracy*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Ehrenberg, John. 1999. *Civil Society: The Critical History of an Idea*. New York and London: New York University Press.
- Ehrenberg, John. 2006. *Servants of Wealth: The Right's Assault on Economic Justice*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Ehrenberg, John, Patrice McSherry, Caroleen Sayej, and Jose Sanchez. 2010. *The Iraq Papers*. New York and London: Oxford University Press.
- Ehrenberg, John. 2017. "What is to be Learned from Occupy's Failure?" *Palgrave Communications* (April). 3:17062 doi: 10.1057/palcomms.2017.62.
- Ehrenberg, John. 2022. *White Nationalism and the Republican Party: Toward Minority Rule in America*. New York and London: Routledge.

See also

Marxism; *New Political Science*

159. Eisenstein, Zillah

Zillah Eisenstein (b. 1948–) is Professor Emerita of Politics at Ithaca College (New York), where she has taught since 1972. Eisenstein is a highly regarded American feminist scholar, political theorist, and activist. She earned a B.A. in Political Science from Ohio University (1968) and a Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of Massachusetts (1972), where she wrote a dissertation, “The Concept of Species Being in Marx and Durkheim: Its Import for Feminist Ideology” under the supervision of William E. Connolly.

Eisenstein’s work has profoundly influenced feminist theory and it is characterized by a commitment to social justice and political activism. She grew up in a communist, antiracist, working-class Jewish family committed to the civil rights movement in the United States. Throughout her career, Eisenstein has been a prominent voice in antiracist feminist scholarship. Her books span a wide range of topics, including the role of women in the new global militarism and anti-imperialism. Eisenstein was one of 151 internationally recognized feminists to sign *Feminist Resistance Against War: A Manifesto* (2022) to support Russian feminists, who opposed the Russian invasion of Ukraine. She has also written on intersectionality, anti-racist feminism, the rise of neoliberalism and the demise of liberal democracy, the masculinist bias of law, the crisis of breast cancer and AIDS, and the patriarchal structuring of race, the new nationalisms, and corporatist multiculturalism, among other topics (Eisenstein 2023).

Eisenstein is widely recognized for her early activism and writing about the sexual violence against Serb and Muslim women in the war in Bosnia, the struggle of women health care workers in Cuba, the challenges that women workers faced mainly in China, Indonesia, India, and elsewhere in the Global South. The book *Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism*, which was edited by Eisenstein in 1978 is a groundbreaking work that explores the intersection of capitalism and patriarchy to argue that the two systems are deeply intertwined and reinforce each other in complex ways. Among her other books are *The Radical Future of Liberal Feminism* (1981), *The*

Color of Gender (1994), and her recent book, *Abolitionist Socialist Feminism: Radicalizing the Next Revolution* (2019).

Eisenstein’s books analyse the multifaceted nature of contemporary racism and misogyny, which can no longer be understood as discrete and homogenous categories. She has mentored and inspired future generations of feminist scholars and activists. As part of her academic pursuits, Eisenstein has served on numerous boards, including the Association L’Almoravido, Association of the Development of Democracy for the Moroccan Sahara New International Advisory Board, ENGENDER, Cape Town South Africa, Board of the W.E.B. Du Bois Center in Ghana, Editorial Board of the *Asian Journal of Women’s Studies*, Executive Board of the Women and Politics Section of the American Political Science Association, and she has been a vocal supporter of progressive political movements.

Eisenstein is recognized as a significant contributor to the feminist movement and a leading voice in the struggle for justice and equality. She remains an important figure in the field of political theory and currently holds the position of Professor Emerita of Political Science of Anti-Racist Feminist Theories at Ithaca College. Her current agenda promotes an intersectional, abolitionist feminism in the context of her larger project to promote gender equality and challenge systems of oppression.

OLGA PATRICIA VELÁSQUEZ OCAMPO

References

- Eisenstein, Zillah. 1978. *Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Eisenstein, Zillah. 1981. *The Radical Future of Liberal Feminism*. New York: Longman Higher Education.
- Eisenstein, Zillah. 1994. *The Color of Gender: Reimagining Democracy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Eisenstein, Zillah. 2019. *Abolitionist Socialist Feminism: Radicalizing the next Revolution*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Eisenstein, Zillah. 2023. “Zillah Eisenstein: My Writings, Thoughts, and Activism.” Available at Zillah Eisenstein | My writings, thoughts, and activism. (wordpress.com). Accessed April 18, 2023.

“Feminist Resistance Against War: A Manifesto.” 2022. Specter Journal, March 17. Available at Feminist Resistance Against War – Spectre Journal. Accessed on April 18, 2023.

See also

Feminist Critiques of Political Science;
Intersectionality

160. Enloe, Cynthia

Cynthia Enloe (b. 1938 New York City) is a world-renowned researcher, educator, and feminist activist. She received her B.A. from Connecticut College (1960), and her M.A. (1963) and Ph.D. in Political Science (1967) from the University of California at Berkeley. After working as an Associate Professor of Political Science at Miami University of Ohio, she started teaching at Clark University, in Worcester, Massachusetts, in 1972. Today, she is a Research Professor at Clark University in the Department of International Development, Community, and Environment. She is affiliated with the Political Science Department and the Women's and Gender Studies program, which she co-founded. Her feminist engagement and interest in the study of gendered power relations was a turning point in the discipline of International Relations (IR). Her ground-breaking work using feminist theory, gender analysis and examining the experiences of women resulted in many publications, including *Bananas and Bases: Making a Feminist Sense of International Politics* (2000), *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives* (2000), and *Globalization and Militarism: Feminists Make the Link* (2007). Her work has been translated into multiple languages, and she appeared on different news channels like the BBC, NPR, and Al-Jazeera. Enloe received numerous awards and honors during her career, including two Fulbright Research Grants, guest professorships, and honorary doctorates. She was a guest lecturer in Canada, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Korea, Turkey, Sweden, Norway, the United Kingdom, United States, and Vietnam.

From the 1980s onwards, after spending the first years of her career as a Comparative Politics specialist focused on ethnic politics in Asia, she dedicated herself to feminist research - always keeping race and ethnicity in mind - connecting her feminist engagement to academics and activists worldwide. At first, she was interested in women in the global clothing industry, critically unpacking the meaning of their work being made "cheap labor." Using a signature research style that intertwined the study of gender politics and the relationship between the local and the global, she then continued taking an interest

in other groups of women who were invisible in mainstream IR: factory workers but also diplomat's wives, sex workers, and domestic aides. The study and the connection between women from different countries experiencing militarism in their everyday lives as well as experiences of women resisting militarism and militarization are at the center of her research. In putting the spotlight on women, her analysis shows that even if they are presented as apolitical, women's roles in those contexts are highly political. Her research feeds into and nurtures transnational networks of feminist activists.

Enloe's work is an essential pillar of feminist approaches in IR and for the gender analysis of conflicts. She serves on different editorial boards, such as the *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, the *European Journal of Women's Studies*, and the *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy*. An exceptional teacher, she values the importance of teaching to and learning from her students. Clark University awarded her the University Senior Faculty Fellow for Excellence in Teaching and Scholarship, and she was selected Outstanding Teacher three times. She also received the Peace and Justice Studies Association's Howard Zinn Lifetime Achievement Award in 2010, was selected as one of the Honorees named on the Gender Justice Legacy Wall (installed in The Hague at the International Crimes Court in 2017), selected Distinguished Scholar of the International Security Studies Section of the ISA in 2020, and named Distinguished Professor in International Relations at the University of Edinburgh in 2021. She also received honorary doctorates from the University of London's School of Oriental and African Studies (2009), Clark University (2014), and the University of Iceland (2020).

Well-known for the quote, "The personal is international" (Enloe 2000a), Enloe highlights the importance of women's experiences and perspectives in studying the international. Asking, "where are the women?" (Enloe 2000b), she enhances the visibility of women and highlights the political importance of the research question for feminist research. Enloe made feminist curiosity (Enloe 2004) a cornerstone of her research agenda. Her research focuses on connections. By unpacking what is unquestioned and seems mundane (Enloe 2011), Enloe highlights the gendered

power relations that connect the local and the international, the institutions and the personal lives. The central themes of her work are anchored in her feminist commitment: militarism, women's resistance to it, globalization, and the politics of masculinity and femininity.

Enloe's analysis of gendered power relations in the international area, coupled with her concern for analysing the human level, broadens the discipline of IR. Examining women's experiences and perspectives, she demonstrated that the militarized experiences of women are different from those of men, who are usually studied. Her career has inspired awards such as the Enloe Award (for best manuscript submitted by an emerging scholar), awarded by the International Feminist Journal of Politics, and the Cynthia Enloe Scholar Activist Award in recognition of impressive scholarly work and activism for a student from the Clark University community.

Inspiring scholars around the world, her ground-breaking work laid the foundations for feminist studies in IR and political science. Her feminist focus expanded perspectives about the subjects of study and the use of interdisciplinary methods within IR. In

questioning the invisible, she pinpointed the processes and decisions reproducing structures of power and hierarchies. Her insistence on the importance of taking women seriously, paired with her insertion of femininities and masculinities into the study of conflict, highlighted how global politics connects to people's everyday lives.

VANESSA GAUTHIER VELA

References

- Enloe, Cynthia. 2000a [first edition 1990]. *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Enloe, Cynthia. 2000b. *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Enloe, Cynthia. 2004. *The Curious Feminist: Searching for Women in a New Age of Empire*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Enloe, Cynthia. 2007. *Globalization and Militarism: Feminists Make the Link*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Enloe, Cynthia. 2011. "The Mundane Matters." *International Political Sociology* 5, 4: 447–50. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-5687.2011.00145_2.x.

161. Frantz, Fanon

The 60th edition of Frantz Fanon's masterwork, *The Wretched of the Earth* (2021) was published in English translation by Grove Press in 2021. The latest edition of Fanon's most widely read book includes an impassioned introduction by Cornel West (2021, vii) who views him as "the greatest revolutionary-intellectual of the mid-twentieth century." In West's view (2021, vii), Fanon "is a towering figure in our neo-liberal and neo-colonial time because he cast a light on the terrifying and terroristic underside of white supremacist European imperialism – a light that enables us to keep track of how those chickens have come to roost around the world." Sixty-three years earlier in 1961, the year Fanon died of leukemia in a Washington D.C. hospital, his major work, *The Wretched of the Earth*, was published in Paris with an introduction by Jean-Paul Sartre. According to Simone de Beauvoir, Fanon's book was to be found exhibited in bookstores across Paris.

Frantz Fanon was a Martiniquean psychiatrist, who became a militant advocate of Algerian liberation and an ardent supporter of African independence. In his writings, he was unrelenting in his condemnation of the dehumanization of colonialism and its degradation of the colonized and the colonizer. His commitment did not preclude a critical view of the limitations of such movements, but he remained steadfast in his support for the goal of liberating "the wretched of the earth" – the exploited peasants, landless agricultural laborers, urban lumpen-proletarians, and other marginalized groups, who were always people of color that bore the brunt of European colonialism (Worsley 1972; Barrow 2020, 86–96). More than six decades after his death in 1961, Fanon's work remains relevant, indeed, urgent. Then as now, the eloquence of his language has served to intensify his exposé of the crimes of colonialism and the human toll of inequality in postcolonial societies in which the persistence of racism and exploitation continue to undermine the claims of the world's leading industrial democracies.

Fanon was born in the French Antilles in 1925, but he moved to Paris to study psychiatry and eventually moved to Algeria to work at the hospital in Blida-Joinville, where he was able to implement some of his radical

innovations in the treatment of patients whom he viewed against the ever-present background of colonial rule. Fanon's experience was reflected in his discussion of "Colonial Wars and Mental Disorders" that was part of *Les Damnés de la Terre* (1961). It conveyed Fanon's understanding that mental illness was not only an individual condition but one influenced by its social and political origins. In the Algerian case, this meant viewing patients against the background of an ever-present colonial rule with its penetrating and divisive effects that left few untouched in society (Fanon 2014). Fanon remained in Algeria until he was expelled by the French authorities and returned to Paris in 1961, the last year of his life.

Fanon's books were published in Paris between 1952 and 1964 and they each recount a searing record of racism and colonialism based on his experience first in the Antilles, a French colony at the time, then in Paris, and later in Algeria during its struggle for liberation from the French. His experience was reflected first in the collection of essays published in 1952 with *Peau Noire, Masques Blancs* (*Black Skin, White Masks*). His last book, a collection of political essays, was published posthumously in 1964 by Maspero under the title *Pour la révolution africaine* (*Toward the African Revolution*). This book brought together some of Fanon's writings on racism and culture, the liberation of Africa, and the predicament of Algeria. This book takes the form of two "letters" – one written to a Frenchman on Fanon's leaving Algeria, and the second written to the French Resident-Minister. Both letters conveyed Fanon's experience as an Algerian doctor working in the psychiatric hospital in Blida-Joinville. His bitter lesson was to relearn the penetrating power of racism and colonialism that affected the wards where he worked no less than the streets where he walked each day.

In 1966, Maspero published Fanon's *Sociologie d'une révolution, l'an V de la révolution algérienne* with an introduction that had been written by the author written in July 1959. In this work, which has not been translated into English, Fanon envisioned the new world to be created by the Algerian revolution with a focus on family and society, including descriptions of the imagined new status of women, the family, and the European minority, along with a discussion of medicine and

colonialism. It reflected the author's grim yet hopeful view of the future of a society in transition. His final words, while reflecting the eloquence of his vision was shared by his comrades in the revolution.

The continued interest in Fanon's work testifies to his ability to convey both a compassionate humanity and a ruthless realism with roots in his life experience that stretches from Martinique to his apprenticeship in Paris and his professional education in colonialism in Algeria. It remains relevant to those who find in Fanon's writings the evidence of a harsh and merciless world they recognize, as well as the vision of a different, more humane future, they aim to share with the rest of humanity.

IRENE GENDZIER

References

- Barrow, Clyde W. 2020. *The Dangerous Class: The Concept of the Lumpenproletariat*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Fanon, Frantz. 2021 [1963]. *The Wretched of the Earth*, translated from the French by Philcox, with commentary by Jean-Paul Sartre and Homi K Bhabha and Cornel West, 60th Anniversary Edition. New York: Grove Press.
- Fanon, Frantz. 1966. *Sociologie d'une revolution, l'an V de la revolution algerienne* [*The Sociology of a Revolution, the year V of the Algerian revolution*]. Paris: Maspero.
- Fanon, Frantz. 1967. *Toward the African Revolution (political essays)*, translated by Haakon Chevalier. New York: Grove Press.
- Fanon, Frantz. 1967. *Black Skin, White Masks*, translated by Charles Lam Markmann. New York: Grove Press.
- Fanon, Frantz. 2014. *Decolonizing Madness: The Psychiatric Writings of Frantz Fanon*, edited by Nigel C. Gibson. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gendzier, Irene L. 1973. *Frantz Fanon, A Critical Study*. New York: Pantheon Books. (Paperback edition by Grove Press appeared in 1973. A Vintage Books edition in paperback was published in 1974 and an Evergreen Edition in 1985. The book has been translated into French and Spanish.)
- Worsley, Peter. 1972. "Frantz Fanon and the 'Lumpenproletariat'." In *Socialist Register 1972*, edited by Ralph Miliband and John Saville, 193–230. London: Merlin Press.

See also

Colonialism; Neo-Colonialism; Theories of Imperialism; Huey P. Newton

162. Federici, Silvia

Silvia Federici (b. 1942 Parma, Italy) was born in the immediate post-war and post-fascist period in Italy. The First World War, fascism, and the anti-fascist and communist struggles in Parma were formative experiences for her. In this context, Federici became politicized at a young age and struggled against a repressive, patriarchal, and catholic 1950s Italy. She received her B.A. from Università degli Studi di Bologna, Italy (1965). In 1966, Federici won a scholarship to attend a literature summer school in Edinburgh, Scotland. A year later, she was awarded a Fulbright Scholarship to study at SUNY Buffalo, where she received her M.A. (1970) and Ph.D. (1980) in Philosophy. Federici taught at the University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria (1984–85), which had a significant impact on her views on globalization, racism, neocolonialism, land, and the commons, and then at Hofstra University.

In addition to teaching, Federici was involved in several social movements. 1967 was a turning point for Federici's development as a theorist and activist. Arriving in the U.S. immediately after the 1967 Detroit riots and at the height of the anti-Vietnam war movement, she joined the anti-war student movement and learned about U.S. racism, slavery, and imperialism. During 1969–71, she worked and wrote for *Telos* and *Town Crier* and became acquainted with the Italian New Left, *Operaismo*, Mario Tronti's Marxism, and helped translate leading Italian theorists into English. She also founded the Committee for Academic Freedom in Africa and the Radical Philosophy Association's Anti-Death Penalty Project with her spouse and collaborator, philosopher George Caffentzis.

Ultimately, Federici's encounter with Mariarosa Dalla Costa and the feminist movement, *Lotta femminista*, proved most decisive for her development as a thinker and activist. In 1972, Federici, Dalla Costa, Brigitte Galtier, and Selma James founded the International Network for Wages for Housework, a global campaign seeking remuneration for women's unwaged housework. Reconstituted as the Wages for Housework Campaign (WFH), the movement spread globally as an alternative to traditional party politics and socialist feminist organizations. Federici's involvement with WFH lasted from its founding until its disso-

lution in 1977. She co-founded The New York Wages for Housework (1973), which faced criticism that it was "paying women to stay at home" (Federici 2018). However, for Federici, the wage was not the end goal of WFH but a strategy to denaturalize female labor, to end domesticity and unwaged labor, and to unveil invisible exploitation. For this reason, Federici favored the description wages *against* not *for* housework (Federici 1975). In her words, WFH is a "revolutionary perspective from a feminist viewpoint and ultimately for the entire working class" (Federici 1975, 2).

Federici's central theoretical contributions to political science lie in her scholarship on feminism and the history of capitalism. Her work on reproductive labor transformed feminist understandings of women's bodies, labor, and sexuality. Federici argues that housework is productive of labor-power and therefore central to the development of capitalism and the accumulation of capital (Federici 1975). For her, thus, capitalism rests on unpaid domestic labor. Federici analyses the wage system as intimately related to patriarchy, sexuality, and the exploitation of women's bodies and labor. She sought to subvert the sexual division of labor, which she argues relies on what she terms "the patriarchy of the wage": the command of women's reproductive labor through the power of the masculine wage (Federici 2004; Federici 2021). As a feminist thinker and activist, Federici fostered solidarity amongst women by emphasizing their role in capitalist production and power of refusal. She theorized reproductive labor as the "ground zero" of revolutionary practice, because it best exhibits contradictions inherent to alienated labor (Federici 2012).

Federici also shaped how political scientists understand the origins and development of capitalism. In her most famous work, *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body, and Primitive Accumulation*, Federici argues that the exploitation of women's labor and bodies is a fundamental step in the transition from feudalism to capitalism and remains central to capitalism's accumulation today (Federici 2004). The book is a revised account of the research on witch-hunts, which Federici published in Italian with Leopoldina Fortunati (1984). For Federici, the witch-hunts constitute a campaign against women's reproductive rights that placed women's bodies, labor, and sexuality under the control of the state.

Using a Marxist framework, Federici argues that the witch-hunts have been overlooked as a form of “primitive accumulation,” a process necessary for the instigation of capitalist society. The separation of productive from reproductive labor, and concomitant devaluation of women’s labor, she argues, was crucial for capitalism’s emergence. Federici’s analysis has been important for decolonial accounts of primitive accumulation as an ongoing process in capitalism, evident in contemporary land enclosures, privatization, abrogation of women’s reproductive rights, and the return of witch-hunts (Federici 2018).

Always critical of capitalism and the limits of traditional socialist and Marxist politics (Federici 2021), Federici offers a new, class-based feminism that reveals the historical character of social relations that masquerade as natural. She turns our attention to the revolutionary potential of our present by highlighting ongoing struggles against patriarchy and capitalism (2019), land enclosures (2005), and feminist reconstructions of the commons (2019).

JETA MULAJ

References

- Federici, Silvia. 1975. *Wages Against Housework*. London: Power of Women Collective.
- Federici, Silvia. 2004. *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body, and Primitive Accumulation*. New York: Autonomedia.
- Federici, Silvia. 2012. *Revolution at Point Zero: Housework, Reproduction, and Feminist Struggle*. New York: PM Press.
- Federici, Silvia. 2018. *Wages for Housework: The New York Committee 1972–1977: History, Theory, Documents*. New York: Autonomedia.
- Federici, Silvia. 2018. *Re-Enchanting the World: Feminism and the Politics of the Commons*. New York: PM Press.
- Federici, Silvia. 2018. *Witches, Witch-Hunting, and Women*. New York: PM Press.
- Federici, Silvia. 2019. *Beyond the Periphery of the Skin: Rethinking, Remaking, and Reclaiming the Body in Contemporary Capitalism*. New York: PM Press.
- Federici, Silvia. 2021. *Patriarchy of the Wage: Notes on Marx, Gender, and Feminism*. New York: PM Press.
- Federici, Silvia and Leopoldina Fortunati. 1984. *Il grande Calibano: storia del corpo sociale ribelle nella prima fase del capitale*. Milan: Franco Angeli.

163. Ferguson, Kathy E.

Kathy E. Ferguson (b. 1950–) is a Professor of Political Science at the University of Hawai'i at Manoa. She is a well-known political scientist and feminist political theorist, who has made significant contributions to the study of feminist theory and anarchism. Ferguson grew up on a farm in central Indiana, where she attended Purdue University and received a B.A. in Political Science (1972). Ferguson (2023) recounts that she became interested in political theory as an undergraduate student, when she attended a class in political theory taught by Michael Weinstein. She continued her studies at the University of Minnesota, where she earned a Ph.D. in Political Science (1976). During her time at Minnesota, Ferguson studied with the renowned political philosopher, Mulford Sibley, who mentored her in writing the department's first dissertation on women and feminism. Ferguson began her academic career at Sienna College, where she rose to the rank of Full Professor (1976–85) before accepting a faculty position in political science and women's studies at the University of Hawai'i at Manoa, where she has remained to the present day.

Ferguson's research interests have largely focused on feminist theory and anarchism. In her book, *The Man Question* (1993), which was devoted to methodological and conceptual issues in feminist theory, Ferguson identified two general orientations in feminist theory: the interpretive and the genealogical. Ferguson argues that interpretive approaches to gender simply reverse patriarchal categories by putting women's experiences and perspectives at the center of their analysis instead of men's perspectives. Genealogy, on the other hand, disputes the very idea of gender and questions whether there is a "center" or a privileged epistemological standpoint of any kind.

Instead of these two approaches, which fail to adequately address the relationship between politics and subjectivity, Ferguson proposes three feminist approaches to subjectivity. Praxis feminism identifies subjectivity as the consequence of what women do (e.g., Nancy Hartsock's standpoint feminism). Cosmic feminism describes how women are related to a cosmological order emphasizing the divinity of nature and women's attunement to this order as practiced in goddess

worship, witchcraft, and ecofeminism. Linguistic feminism focuses on the role of language in constructing women as subjects and thus it aims to destabilize existing categories of gender (e.g., Kristeva, Butler). Ferguson suggests that each of these feminisms employs a defining set of metaphors, rhetoric, and images, such as images of motherhood as the "true self," metaphors of depth and wholeness, or the (sexualized) body and vaginal metaphors, respectively.

However, for most of her career, Ferguson's scholarship has explored the intersection of feminist theory and anarchism as exemplified in her books, *The Feminist Case Against Bureaucracy* (1984), *Emma Goldman: Political Thinking in the Streets* (2011), and *The Letterpress Revolution: The Politics of Anarchist Print* (2023).

In *The Feminist Case Against Bureaucracy*, Ferguson provides a feminist critique of organization theory, public administration, and personnel management, which are fields that have traditionally lacked a feminist perspective. She argues that while bureaucracies may include women, bureaucracy is nevertheless fundamentally incompatible with feminism. She examines how bureaucratic language and institutions increasingly dominate contemporary life to draw parallels between the traditional political situation of domination and subordination experienced by women and that experienced by bureaucrats. Thus, she argues that bureaucrats become "feminized" and adopt the behaviors and characteristics traditionally associated with women's roles, such as attention to image management, a superior's requirements and morale, interpersonal relations, and avoidance of confrontation.

In *Emma Goldman: Political Thinking in the Streets* (2011), Ferguson breaks with the traditional way of writing intellectual history by combining political theory with anarchist and labor union history, and a biographical narrative of Goldman's rich personal life. Ferguson also makes the innovative move of analysing Goldman's political thought through the lens of other political thinkers such as Friedrich Nietzsche, Jean Baudrillard, Michel Foucault, and Pierre Bourdieu, which helps situate Goldman's thinking within the larger field of contemporary political theory. Moreover, by focusing on anarchist women and their contributions to political thought, Ferguson challenges the traditional narrative

of anarchism as a male-dominated ideology and, in fact, in her research on Goldman, Ferguson (2023) observes that she discovered “many hundreds of other interesting anarchist women. Accordingly, I’m currently writing a book on anarchist women, primarily in the U.S. and Britain, from 1870–1940. My goal is to bring women more fully into anarchism, and at the same time to bring anarchism more fully into feminism.”

In 2019, Ferguson was awarded the Okin-Young Award in Feminist Political Theory for her article on “Discourses of Danger: Locating Emma Goldman” (Ferguson 2008). This award, which is sponsored by the Women, Gender, and Politics Research Section of the American Political Science Association, recognizes the best paper on feminist political theory published in an English language academic journal during the previous calendar year.

SOFÍA PÉREZ GIL

References

- Ferguson, Kathy E. 1980. *Self, Society, and Womankind: The Dialectic of Liberation*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Ferguson, Kathy E. 1984. *The Feminist Case Against Bureaucracy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Ferguson, Kathy E. 1993. *The Man Question: Visions of Subjectivity in Feminist Theory*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ferguson, Kathy E. 2008. “Discourses of Danger: Locating Emma Goldman.” *Political Theory* 36, no. 5: 735–61.
- Ferguson, Kathy E. 2011. *Emma Goldman: Political Thinking in the Streets*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Ferguson, Kathy E. 2023. *Letterpress Revolution: The Politics of Anarchist Print Culture*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Ferguson, Kathy E. 2023. “Kathy E. Ferguson: Professor.” Available at Kathy Ferguson - Department of Political Science, UH Mānoa (hawaii.edu).

See also

Feminist Critiques of Political Science; Feminist Theory and the State

164. Foucault, Michel

Michel Foucault (1926–84) was a French thinker, public intellectual, and political activist who transformed the way scholars across disciplines understand power and its entanglement with knowledge. Foucault attended the École Normale Supérieure, where he studied with Merleau-Ponty, Louis Althusser, and Jean Hyppolite. Foucault went on to earn advanced degrees in philosophy and psychology at the University of Paris (Sorbonne), where Georges Canguilhem supervised his dissertation on the history of madness. Foucault held appointments at the University of Lille (1955–60), the University of Clermont-Ferrand (1960–66), the University of Tunis (1966–68), and the Collège de France (1969–84), where he served as Professor of the History of Systems of Thought. Foucault also lectured at universities around the world, including the University of Buffalo (1970, 1972), and the University of California at Berkeley (1980, 1983), and the University of Vermont (1982). Foucault briefly joined the French Communist Party and remained politically active throughout his life, often participating in protests and speaking out on behalf of marginalized groups. In 1970 he co-founded *Groupe d'information sur les prisons* to expose conditions in prisons.

Various described as a structuralist, a poststructuralist, and a postmodernist, Foucault conducted historically detailed and theoretically innovative investigations of the rationalities behind and the uses and effects of practices in various fields. Borrowing from Friedrich Nietzsche, Foucault characterized his methodology as “genealogy,” a form of historical investigation aimed at reconstructing the discourses and knowledges surrounding objects without any assumptions about their rationality and without reference to any transcendental notions of the subject (1980). Foucault described the focus of his work as “the different modes by which, in our culture, human beings are made subjects,” in terms of both being subject to power and attached to a stable identity (1994c, 326). Labels such as “delinquent,” “sane,” and “homosexual” are not universal, stable, or objective categories but the results of very particular and historically contingent constellations of forces. The notion that even ostensibly natural things

like the body and sexuality are discursively constructed in particular historical formations contributed to critiques of positivism and influenced scholarship in gender, feminist, post-colonial, critical race, and science and technology studies.

Although Foucault insisted that the state, sovereignty, and law are all important in understanding the workings of power, his most significant contributions focused on relations of power beyond the state. His work revealed how power operates in relations between teachers and students, doctors and patients, and many other social relations conventionally thought to lie outside the domain of politics.

In contrast to approaches that conceive of power as a quantifiable substance originating in a single source, Foucault analysed power as a set of relations operating in and through networks of discourses, knowledges, and institutions, such as prisons, schools, and hospitals. By focusing on the “how” rather than the “what” of power, Foucault was able to illustrate that power extends into those “capillaries” of society that individuals encounter at the local level in everyday life. He shifted the focus from visible and unidirectional displays of top-down “sovereign power” and toward the apparatuses, techniques, and “micro-mechanisms of power” that pervade society (1980, 101). He hence drew attention to the subtle and insidious ways that subjects are surveilled, normalized, and formed. For instance, reformist projects intended to produce more humane forms of punishment often result in more effective and complete forms of control, including through the internalization of norms (1995). By moving away from repressive notions of power associated with Freudian psychoanalysis, Foucault pointed to the generative ability of power to “make people act and speak” (1994c, 172). And as against deterministic accounts of power detected in some aspects of Marxism, Foucault coined concepts such as “disciplinary power,” “biopolitics,” and “governmentality” to convey the polymorphous and multidimensional quality of power.

Despite his critiques of Marxism, Foucault shared Marx’s interest in understanding present conditions in order to problematize and transform them. Foucault’s critiques did not involve explicit condemnations of existing practices, but uncovered the hidden assumptions and unexamined ideas that

sustain them. He rejected the label of philosopher and theorist because he did not seek to prescribe a general system and shunned grand theorizing (1980, 80–81). Nevertheless, his critiques of the rationalistic and positivistic assumptions underlying human and natural sciences generated powerful insights into the discontinuities and contingent historical forces at work in all claims to knowledge. In detailed archival research tracing the development of modern sciences and their attendant institutional expressions in psychiatry (1988), medicine (1994a), and criminology (1995), Foucault demonstrated that the social sciences are “profoundly enmeshed in social structures” (1994c, 112). Claims to knowledge and truth are thus never outside social relations, including relations of power, or history, but are always embedded in and reflective of them. Any successful claim to knowledge or status as a science is always the result of a struggle in which “subjugated knowledges” are discarded and disqualified (1980). Despite the pessimistic implications of these observations, Foucault insisted on the possibility of resistance. As he argued in *The Order of Things* (1994b), even the conditions of truth itself are subject to change over time, reminding readers that nothing is fixed or permanent.

CLEMENT FATOVIC

References

- Foucault, Michel. 1980. “Two Lectures” in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*, 78–108. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, Michel. 1988 [1961]. *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. New York: Vintage.
- Foucault, Michel. 1994a [1963]. *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception*. New York: Vintage.
- Foucault, Michel. 1994b [1966]. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Vintage.
- Foucault, Michel. 1994c. *Power: The Essential Works of Foucault, 1954–1984*. New York: The New Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 1995 [1975]. *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage.

Further readings

- Foucault, Michel. 1982 [1969]. *The Archaeology of Knowledge: And the Discourse on Language*. New York: Vintage.
- Foucault, Michel. 1990 [1976]. *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1: An Introduction*. New York: Vintage.

See also

Genealogy; Power Structure Analysis; Post-Structuralism; Power

165. Fraser, Nancy

Nancy Fraser (b. May 20, 1947) is the Henry A. and Louise Loeb Professor of Philosophy and Politics at the New School for Social Research. Before arriving at the New School, she taught at the University of Georgia and Northwestern University. Her work centers on modern continental political thought, feminism, theories of justice, and contemporary left politics.

Throughout her career she has attempted to undermine the many “false antitheses” she has identified as endemic in political theory and radical political practice. In particular, she has attempted to fuse postmodern and critical theoretic understandings of justice and strategies for social change into a philosophical-political standpoint she refers to as “critical pragmatism.” This position holds that standards for judging the justness of existing social practices can still be constructed without these principles making claims to metaphysical truth. Furthermore, she claims such situated principles of criticism can be used to inform emancipatory political practices.

This “critical pragmatism” can be seen in her first major work, *Unruly Practices: Power, Discourse and Gender in Contemporary Society* (1989). In these essays she criticizes figures from both the critical theory tradition such as Habermas and post-modern tradition such as Foucault for their blind spots and adherence to maximalist interpretations of their theoretical positions. Her undermining of “false antitheses” can also be seen through her participation in the book *Feminist Contentions: A Philosophical Exchange* (1995) where she occupies a median position between Seyla Benhabib and Judith Butler on the questions of the nature of resistance, identity and criticism in the post-modern age.

Her insights are not limited to mere criticism in *Unruly Practices* (1989). In this work she also embarks upon her larger project of reconstructing the concept of critical justice in a postmodern world. In the essay “Struggle Over Needs: Outline of a Socialist-Feminist Critical Theory of Late Capitalist Political Culture” she observes how feminist social movements pioneered a strategy of insisting social phenomena often seen private issues such as childcare are actually public needs that require social support and should be

subject to public revision. Despite the fact that her vision of a political “struggle over needs” does not aspire to produce the “truth,” she claims “we can distinguish better from worse interpretations of people need” (1989, 182). Assessing outcomes of this struggle according to procedural criteria such as the openness of the discussion and thoroughness assessments of the consequences of the need, for her, provides a standard that allows for flexibility, critical power, and normative desirability.

This reconstructive project takes a large step forward in her work *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections of the “Post Socialist Condition”* (1997) and *Redistribution or Recognition: A Philosophical Exchange* (2003). In these works she articulates a theory of radical justice that demands both material redistribution and reciprocal recognition of traditionally marginalized identities. This combination mandates that both redistribution and recognition result in what she calls reconstructive social transformation, where traditional understandings of both production and identity are rethought in order to maximize justice on both axes. She claims that left political movements have bifurcated these concerns with most identifying with only one of these foci, a rift that has hobbled radical politics. Although she does not articulate any final institutional formations, she does offer the principle of “participatory parity” as a standard by which to judge future progress toward justice. This principle mandates that any policy should be deemed unjust if it limits the social or political ability to contribute equally to the shared environment that affects their lives.

Fraser expands on this theory of justice in *Scales of Justice: Reimagining Political Space in a Globalizing World* (2009) through her articulation of a third metric, that of representation. She does this in order to augment her, unto this point, economic and social understanding of justice with harms that originate in politics. She argues that those who are excluded from relevant political decisions, both internal and external to established political boundaries, face exclusions as powerful as those stemming from lack of resources and discriminatory social status. Thus the ability to deconstruct the political demarcations, especially international borders, that rob people of participatory politics constitutes just as important a task as

ensuring equal resources and equal respect to any left project.

With this new understanding of justice and critical theory fully articulated, Fraser then turns to applying it to the problems facing the contemporary left. She begins this process in *The Fortunes of Feminism: From State Managed Capitalism to Neoliberal Crisis* (2013) and *Feminism for the 99%* (2019). In these works she decries what she calls a “neoliberal feminism” that celebrates women’s ability to gain power in an unjust system, but does not question the system itself. She emphasizes that any true feminism must be a socialist feminism that allows women the resources, in what are traditionally deemed the public and private spheres, to make autonomous choices about their lives.

Her latest major work, *Cannibal Capitalism: How Our System is Devouring Democracy, Care and the Planet – and What We Can Do About it* (2022) applies all of her earlier insights to a new analysis of capitalism. She contends while many see the main injustice of capitalism as expropriation – workers not getting the full amount of value that they create, it has always been accompanied by appropriation, stealing from those who are excluded from membership in capitalist political communities. Whether it was forcing women to undertake the unpaid reproductive labor which capitalism required, or robbing nonwestern countries of resources and human labor through imperialism and slavery, she contends that capitalism has always relied, and continues to rely upon all three metrics of injustice, that is, maldistribution, misrecognition, and nonrepresentation. Despite the power of a system that both exploits and appropriates, she claims that these two forms of extraction exist in contradiction – as capitalism’s rapacious drive

to expropriate surplus values, undermines the physical and social worlds upon which it depends to reproduce itself.

In sum, Fraser’s work, rooted in its perspective of critical pragmatism has articulated not only a theory of justice, but also has attempted to use this theory to shed light upon the contemporary left strategy. She has insisted that radical social movements address not only individual injustices, but the multi-faceted systemic connections between these seemingly disconnected phenomena.

JASON KOSNOSKI

References

- Fraser, Nancy. 1989. *Unruly Practices: Power, Discourse, and Gender in Contemporary Social Theory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Fraser, Nancy. 1997. *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections of the “Post Socialist Condition.”* London: Routledge.
- Fraser, Nancy. 2009. *Scales of Justice: Reimagining Political Space in a Globalizing World*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Fraser, Nancy. 2013. *The Fortunes of Feminism: From State Managed-Capitalism to Neoliberal Crisis*. London: Verso.
- Fraser, Nancy. 2022. *Cannibal Capitalism: How Our System is Devouring Democracy, Care and the Planet – and What We Can Do About it*. London: Verso.
- Fraser, Nancy with Seyla Benhabib, Judith Butler, and Drucilla Cornell. 1995. *Feminist Contentions; A Philosophical Exchange*. London: Routledge.
- Fraser, Nancy with Axel Honneth. 2003. *Redistribution or Recognition: A Political-Philosophical Exchange*. London: Verso.
- Fraser, Nancy with Cinzia Arruzza and Tithi Bhattachary. 2019. *Feminism for the 99%: A Manifesto*. London: Verso.

166. Freire, Paulo

Paulo Reglus Neves Freire (September 19, 1921–May 2, 1997) was a Brazilian educator and philosopher best known for his influential approach to critical pedagogy. Born in Recife, in northern Brazil, his childhood was marked by the Great Depression, poverty, and hunger, which affected his learning abilities as a child (Kirylo 2011, 7–8). He graduated in Law at the University of Recife, but soon began working as a Portuguese teacher in adult education programs. He later took up public service directing the Pernambuco Department of Education and Culture (1947–54) and the Cultural Extension Department at the University of Recife (1961–64). He received his doctorate in Philosophy and History (1958) from the same university and taught there several years. The military regime installed after 1964 persecuted and imprisoned Freire, leading to his exile in Bolivia and Chile.

While in exile, he published his opus magnum *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970). The book maintained that traditional forms of education emphasized the unilateral transfer of knowledge from teacher to student and, in so doing, perpetuated social inequality and reinforced oppression. He defined oppression as a systemic phenomenon, “a dehumanized and dehumanizing totality affecting both the oppressors and those whom they oppress” (Freire 1970, 48). He saw such oppressive structures as deeply embedded in social, political, cultural, and economic spheres, with ‘domesticating’ effects over the marginalized (Freire 1970, 51). Dominant educational systems, Freire argued, reinforced those structures through what he calls the “banking model” of education, “in which the students are the depositories and the teacher is the depositor” (Freire 1970, 70) of knowledge.

Freire condemned this unilateralism in teaching, which dehumanizes students and treats them as “adaptable, manageable beings” to be turned into “automatons” (Freire 1970, 74): “the dominant elites utilize the banking concept to encourage passivity in the oppressed” (Freire 1970, 95). Education is therefore necessarily political: educators must resort to “problem-posing” strategies that instead acknowledge students’ own knowledge, humanity, and creativity,

affirming them “as beings in the process of becoming” (Freire 1970, 84). In later works, such as *The Politics of Education* (1985) and *We Make the Road by Walking* (1990), Freire further explores the link between education and power as neoliberalism rises globally, and the potential of education to empower marginalized communities.

His dialogical and participatory view of education conceives teachers and students working together to reciprocally create situated knowledge. In Freire’s problem-posing model “the teacher becomes a facilitator, the traditional class becomes a cultural circle” (Schugurensky 1998, 19) and the focus lies on context-bound reflections aimed at understanding one’s own social and political reality. It enables critical dialogue between educators and students about “their *objective situation* and their *awareness* of that situation” (Freire 1970, 95) and leads to reflection over how to be in the world and transform it. This “revolutionary” method takes ‘peoples’ historicity as their starting point” to raise questions about the nature of societal orders and their oppressive structures (Freire 1970, 84). Only this kind of education can make possible the “practice of freedom,” insofar it allows students to “apprehend the challenge as interrelated to other problems within a total context, not as a theoretical question” (Freire 1970, 83).

To realize this emancipatory potential, educators must engage in labors of “conscientization,” or critical consciousness-raising. The concept – adopted from the original Portuguese *conscientização* – captures the process of reflection and action through which individuals develop a critical understanding of oppression in order to take action to challenge and transform those oppressive structures. In Freire’s words, it is the “deepening of the attitude of awareness” (Freire 1970, 109) that, “through action, prepares men for the struggle against the obstacles to their humanization” (Freire 1970, 119). In *Education for Critical Consciousness* (1973), Freire builds on the emancipatory power of education, arguing that it can either reinforce the status quo or contribute to the transformation of society, depending on whether it fosters critical thinking and encourages students to question and challenge the world around them, or instead trains them to adapt to existing norms and values (Freire 1973, 34).

Freire was a Christian. He believed in the consistency mandated by catholic ideals of solidarity and humanism and between faith and praxis (McLaren and Jandrić 2018, 253–4). His work was also heavily influenced by Marxism, existentialism and humanism (Schugurensky 1998, 19). Freire viewed Christianity as a religion of liberation that challenges oppressive social structures, in line with thinkers and practitioners of liberation theology.

Moreover, Freire's work was not limited to pedagogic theory. Rather, his reflections were informed by his own engagement in grass-roots work and activism. Since his early years as educator, he led adult literacy programs for diverse marginalized groups: workers and peasants who participated in Freire's cultural circles famously "acquired literacy skills in a record time of forty days" (Freire 1998, 20). After his successful *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Freire held a visiting professorship at Harvard (1969), but also led literacy programs in Tanzania, Guinea-Bissau, Angola, Mozambique, Peru, and Nicaragua (McLaren and Jandrić 2018, 247). As Brazil began transitioning to democracy in 1980, he returned to the country and joined the leftist Workers' Party (PT) to lead their adult education program. He was later appointed as Secretary of Education during PT's administration in São Paulo (1988–91).

Freire was a lifelong advocate for social justice whose ideas influenced a range of social movements, from feminism to black liberation (Kirylo 2011, 195–212). He received numerous awards and honors, including honorary doctorates from universities in Brazil, the United States, and Europe. His work has been widely translated and has had a significant impact on educational theory and practice around the world (Kirylo 2011, 121). He has been criticized, however, for his difficult writing style and sexist language (hooks [1993] 2002, 148). A substantial critique targets instead his conception

of oppression for being overly universalizing and inattentive to historic specificity, therefore subordinating experiences of race, gender or ethnicity (Giroux 2009). Freire acknowledged many limitations in his earlier work and his original approach, rooted in the tenets of progressive education, Marxism and liberation theology and strongly oriented towards class. He later sought to include corrections enriched by postcolonial theory and black anticolonial movements, feminism, critical race theory and post-modernism (Schugurensky 1998, 17–18).

MELISA ROSS

References

- Freire, Paulo. 1970. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Herder and Herder.
- Freire, Paulo. 1973. *Education for Critical Consciousness*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Freire, Paulo. 1985. *The Politics of Education: Culture, Power, and Liberation*. Westport: Bergin & Garvey.
- Freire, Paulo. 1990. *Pedagogy of Hope: Reliving Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Giroux, Henry A. 2009. "Paulo Freire and the Politics of Postcolonialism." *Journal of Advanced Composition* 12: 79–89.
- hooks, bell. [1993] 2002. "Speaking About Paulo Freire – the Man, His Work". In *Paulo Freire: A Critical Encounter*, edited by Peter Leonard and Peter McLaren, 145–52. Routledge.
- Horton, Miles and Paulo Freire. 1990. *We Make the Road by Walking. Conversations on Education and Social Change*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Kirylo, James D. 2011. *Paulo Freire: The Man from Recife*. Counterpoints Vol. 385. New York: Peter Lang.
- McLaren, Peter, and Petar Jandrić. 2018. "Paulo Freire and Liberation Theology: The Christian Consciousness of Critical Pedagogy." *Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Pädagogik* 94.2: 246–64.
- Schugurensky, Daniel. 1998. "The Legacy of Paulo Freire: A Critical Review of His Contributions." *Convergence* 31: 17–29.

167. Galbraith, John Kenneth

John Kenneth Galbraith (October 15, 1908–April 29, 2006) was a leading Canadian-American economist from the 1950s through the 1970s, but he is an ambiguous figure with respect to a radical critique of the social sciences. First, Galbraith openly supported the Democratic Party. His appointment by President John F. Kennedy to serve as the U.S. ambassador to India in 1961 suggest a political outlook that was comfortably within the political mainstream of the time, although the fact that he was a founding member of Americans for Democratic Action and his support for U.S. Senator George McGovern's Presidential candidacy in 1972 suggests a slightly more "social democratic" outlook. Second, however, as was lamented by fellow economist Robert Heilbroner in 1970, it seemed that Galbraith "would rather make a joke than push a point to its ethical implication" (Stanfield 1996, 6).

Nevertheless, others are happy to claim him as a leading representative of the heterodox political economy indigenous to the U.S. known as "American institutionalism," "original institutional economics," or "critical institutionalism." This tradition, deriving from the pioneering works of Thorstein Veblen and John R. Commons, among others, has strong affinities with the philosophical pragmatism associated of John Dewey. It combines a critical awareness of the power embedded in social structures with a keen policy orientation intended to address it for wider social benefit. In this respect, it is a reformist, rather than a revolutionary, school of thought.

Galbraith was raised on a farm and trained in agricultural economics. He was already well equipped to resist the impracticalities of the emergent neoclassical economics' theoretical elegance in the 1930s after completing his doctorate at the University of California at Berkeley, which hosted a number of prominent radicals including Robert Brady and Leo Rogin. Upon receiving his Ph.D., Galbraith was immediately appointed to the Department of Economics at Harvard University, where he remained for the rest of his professional life, aside from the frequent interruptions associated with public service, starting in the

U.S. Department of Agriculture during the New Deal era.

A particularly formative experience was Galbraith's service in the Office of Price Administration during the Second World War. This yielded a monograph, *A Theory of Price Control* (1952), in which various themes that would emerge more prominently in later works can already be identified. Also in 1952, he published *American Capitalism: The Concept of Countervailing Power*, which addressed the U.S. system of industrial relations and its economic impact on the nation. Most significantly, in respect to the latter, the role of power in determining the pattern of distribution marked Galbraith as deviating significantly from an economics discipline that, aided by Cold War atmospherics, increasingly self-identified as a "value free" science of markets with the mathematical prowess to prove it.

Galbraith's first major theoretical intervention, *The Affluent Society* (Galbraith 1958) sold millions of copies and ran to several editions over the next decades, quite unlike conventional books on economics, which were increasingly unreadable due to the scientific veneer provided by copious quantities of algebra. Galbraith, meanwhile, elaborated a theory of social balance, and made pointed observations about private affluence amid public squalor as an inevitable outcome of a set of power relationships serving vested ("pecuniary") interests that create the illusion of scarcity amid plenty in order to drive private material acquisition. This consumerist possessive individualism created and exacerbated a social imbalance between the private and public spheres at the expense of the latter. To illustrate, Galbraith highlighted the poor air quality of large cities created by individual garbage disposal systems and automobile use, alongside more generalized pollution. The book presciently identified significant sources of social conflicts that arose in the following decades such as fiscal crisis and environmental degradation.

Galbraith's *The New Industrial State* (1967) offered a detailed study of the modern business corporation, its internal organization, and external deployment of power. Whereas conventional economics effectively reduced the study of the firm to profit-maximizing black boxes in various states of competition, Galbraith highlighted the significance of the oligopolistic corporation as a gatherer, pro-

cessor, and analyst of information – as an embodiment of the “planning system,” that sector of the economy comprising large firms with considerable market power. Information served the strategic purpose of defending the corporation’s competitive position in a carefully managed rivalry, whilst augmenting its structural power over consumers and smaller, dependent enterprises, including suppliers and retailers, comprising the “market system.” Hence the growth of the “technostructure,” the university-educated data analysts purposed with generating the information to serve those ends. Contrary to orthodox economics’ prized notion of consumer sovereignty, Galbraith developed the concept of the “revised sequence,” in which the corporations effectively limit the choices available to consumers via the use of sophisticated marketing techniques, which was an argument strikingly similar to the Monopoly Capital school’s contemporaneous observations regarding both oligopolistic competition and the “sales effort” (Baran and Sweezy 1966).

In *Economics and the Public Purpose*, Galbraith (1973) returned to the social costs of an outsized private sector, albeit now in a visibly deteriorating economic and political context. Growing unemployment and accelerating deindustrialization prompted Galbraith to advocate a guaranteed minimum income tied to the average observed in oligopolistic corporations, thereby putting a floor under wages earned in the market system. The author’s more general sense of

urgency, insisting on an actively and downwardly redistributive and coordinating state was encapsulated in the title of the book’s 27th chapter: “The socialist imperative.”

Galbraith’s subsequent writings mostly restated or made minor adjustments to key aspects of his earlier analysis, often ruefully, given the political triumph of the New Right by 1980. Nevertheless, his popular account of the onset of the Great Depression, *The Great Crash* (1955), continues to provide insight and analysis of contemporary relevance to those wishing to understand the latest financial crisis. For this reason, it has never been out of print. Meanwhile Galbraith’s significant corpus continues to inspire and inform the work of those advancing the tradition of original institutional economics in the *Journal of Economic Issues* and other heterodox publications.

MICHAEL KEANEY

References

- Baran, Paul A. and Paul M. Sweezy. 1966. *Monopoly Capital: An Essay on the American Economic and Social Order*. New York and London: Monthly Review Press.
- Galbraith, John Kenneth. 1958. *The Affluent Society*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Galbraith, John Kenneth. 1967. *The New Industrial State*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Galbraith, John Kenneth. 1973. *Economics and the Public Purpose*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Stanfield, James Ronald. 1996. *John Kenneth Galbraith*. New York: St. Martin’s Press.

168. Garvey, Marcus

Marcus Mosiah Garvey, Jr. (b. August 17, 1887–d. June 10, 1940) was born in Jamaica, where he became one of the most important black intellectuals of the twentieth century articulating a brand of black nationalism and Pan-Africanism that came to be distinctly recognized as “Garveyism” (Garvey 2016, 2020). Garvey is best known as the founder and first President-General, of the Universal Negro Improvement Association and African Communities League (UNIA-ACL), which he used as a platform to declare himself the Provisional President of Africa (Hill 1983).

Garvey was born to a middle-class Afro-Jamaican family, and in his youth, he apprenticed to become a printer. However, Garvey grew up under the weight of the British colonial system, which enforced a rigid hierarchy that separated white English families from mixed race “mulattoes” and the lowest caste of dark-skinned and indigenous peoples of which Garvey was a member (Graves 1962, 65–6). Garvey left Jamaica and traveled briefly to Costa Rica, Panama, and England, where he studied at the University of London. He returned to Jamaica in 1914 and founded the UNIA. In 1916, Garvey moved to the United States and settled in the Harlem district of New York City, where he established a local chapter of the UNIA. Garvey articulated a form of black nationalism that sought to build racial identity through the celebration of African history and culture. Garvey and the UNIA promoted the “back to Africa” movement as a way to promote Pan-Africanism and to build unity between African communities and the African diaspora in the Western hemisphere.

However, Garvey’s version of black nationalism advocated racial separatism and, thus, he was a controversial figure in and out of the Black community, where he was often viewed as a counterpoint to the philosophy and politics of W.E.B. Du Bois, who promoted racial integration. In the United States, Garvey was dismissed by many Black leaders, who ironically urged him to return to Jamaica. Nevertheless, Garvey found support in Harlem within the large West Indian population of New York City. West Indian immigrants had come to the United States with the idea that it was a place where racial harmony

and equality were possible. However, when faced with discriminatory actions and racial prejudice of white Americans, many became critical of the false promise of “the American Dream,” including Black Americans who they believed had been “taken in” by this false promise of racial equality (Graves 1962, 66; Garvey 1972).

Black populations in many cities across the nation with similar experiences came to support Garvey’s program. His newspaper, *The Voice of the Negro*, boasted a circulation of 100,000. As an advocate of Black nationalism in the United States, Garvey sought to offset the rising tide of white nationalism and racial supremacy that was increasingly ascendent during this time (1890–1940). Garvey questioned whether Black Americans should fight for their status as U.S. citizens, which he argued would ultimately mean accepting second class citizenship. Moreover, Black Americans were still *de jure* segregated and disenfranchised by Jim Crow laws, while being subject to the violence and threats of a resurgent Ku Klux Klan, the Knights of the White Camelia, and newly formed Angle-Saxon clubs. As a result, African American disillusionment left many in a plight of utter hopelessness of ever having full rights to freedom in the United States.

In this context, Garveyism would emerge as a movement for African nationalism that sought to create a homeland for all Blacks throughout the world, although Garveyists continued to be criticized by liberals for promoting segregation as the only possible solution to the race problem. Garvey was often criticized for articulating an unrealistic and escapist program of racial chauvinism. DuBois dismissed Garvey’s black nationalism and Pan-Africanism as an “impossible” program and a product of Garvey’s “childish ignorance of the stern facts of the world” (Ewing 2011, 137). Some Black American intellectuals denounced Garveyism as a racist policy because of its separatist ideology.

At its pinnacle, Garvey’s program found support in Africa, where he was welcomed as an almost messiah-like figure who would one day free all Black people from the strangle-hold of European imperialists (“Marcus Garvey” 1940, 592). Consequently, the European imperial powers came to see Garvey as an “evil influence” in their African colonies and he even garnered the attention

of the U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and its director J. Edgar Hoover. As a result of this attention, Garvey was portrayed as a swindler by the U.S. Government and, in 1922, he was convicted of mail fraud and sent to the Atlanta Federal Penitentiary. After serving five years in prison, Garvey's sentence was commuted by U.S. President Calvin Coolidge. After leaving prison, Garvey continued his activism, but with little fanfare or success. He died on June 10, 1940 after multiple strokes.

STACY MADDERN

References

- Ewing, Adam. 2011. "Garvey or Garveyism." *Transition* No. 105: 130–45.
- Graves, John L. 1962. "The Social Ideas of Marcus Garvey." *The Journal of Negro Education* 31, no. 1 (Winter): 65–74.
- Hill, Robert A. 1983. *Marcus Garvey and Universal Negro Improvement Association Papers*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Garvey, Marcus. 1972 [1927]. *Tragedy of White Injustice*. New York: Haskell House Publishers.
- Garvey, Marcus. 2016. *Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey: Africa for the Africans*, 2 Volumes, edited and compiled Amy Jacques Garvey. Chicago: Frontline Books.
- Garvey, Marcus. 2020. *Message to the People: The Course of African Philosophy*. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, Inc.
- "Marcus Garvey." 1940. *Journal of Negro History* 25, no. 4 (October): 590–92.

Further readings

- Jimison, Linda S., ed. 1995. *Marcus Garvey, Man of Vision and Action: His Life, Ideology, and Work*. Indianapolis, IN: LifeStar Enterprises.
- Wintz, Cary, ed. 1996. *African American Political Thought, 1890-1930: Washington, Du Bois, Garvey, and Randolph*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

See also

- W.E.B. Du Bois; Racialization

169. Gindin, Sam

Sam Gindin (b. 1945 Kaminsky Ural, Siberia, former Soviet Union) is a Canadian educator, union activist, and public intellectual, who is widely recognized for his research on the North American labor movement, the political economy of neoliberal globalization, and for his interventions into debates about socialist strategy. Besides his books, Gindin has written hundreds of articles in both scholarly journals and popular publications of the left across the English-speaking world.

Gindin's parents were from Belarus and were part of the Jewish population evacuated by the Red Army to Siberia as the German Nazis advanced on the Soviet Union. As refugees at the end of the war, his family eventually landed in North Winnipeg, where Gindin grew up, earned a degree in economics at the University of Manitoba, and followed that with graduate work at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. He left Madison in 1974 to take a position as Director of Research with the Canadian Auto Workers (at the time the Canadian affiliate of the Detroit-centered United Auto Workers – UAW) in Toronto, where he worked for more than 25 years before retiring as Assistant to the President in 2000. Soon after Gindin took up a post at York University, where he held the Packer Chair in Social Justice in the Department of Political Science for a decade, alongside long-time colleagues Leo Panitch and Greg Albo. Gindin has remained active in social and labor movements, and in the organizing and educational work of the Socialist Project in Toronto.

The research agenda that became central to Gindin's writings emerged out of his experiences inside the North American union movement and his developing interpretation of Marxian political economy. On the one hand, the continuous introduction of new technologies, organizational forms, and products pushed the capitalist class to constantly innovate and struggle for managerial control over workplaces and over the allocation of investments. On the other hand, the dependence of value production on the exploitation of workers' labor and skills in ever more complex workplaces opened spaces for workers to organize, and demanded that workers and unions frame their agendas for bargaining, workplace controls, and political

power (through unions, communities, parties) over the economic surplus at the level of the state. The central place of the auto sector in this ongoing process of capitalist restructuring and workplace struggle, and the generalization of the so-called postwar "Fordist" and "neoliberal" phases of capitalism, provided fertile intellectual and political terrain for Gindin to form his thinking and political engagements.

In the decades Gindin spent with the CAW a few themes gained special salience in his thinking as the crisis of the liberal postwar order deepened in the 1970s:

- concessions bargaining could only intensify competition, strengthen the company, and weaken the union movement;
- the introduction of new computer technologies into factories was meant to increase the rate of exploitation of workers and enforce the practices of "lean production," rendering the social democratic notion of a "progressive competitiveness" alternative of bargaining compromises with the company and the state an utterly utopian one;
- union educational programs were essential to building workers' capacities to struggle in the workplace and the confidence to challenge management in collective bargaining (and the union leadership as needed); and
- "class struggle unionism" depended upon the broader balance of class forces and thus working class institutions and cultural formation not limited to workplaces.

Following Marx, Gindin has often underscored that workers could not avoid coming to terms with their employers and national capitalist classes, as no economic or political gains were ever permanently secure in the class divisions of capitalist societies. All these contentions about trade union politics figured practically in the split from the U.S. dominated UAW, which led to the formation of the CAW in 1985, particularly the divisions between the two unions over concessions to the auto companies, the autonomy of Canadian workers to make their own decisions, and the political role of union education. As a pivotal staff person in the union, Gindin was immersed in the strategic debates surrounding the organizational break. In his book on the history of the CAW,

The Canadian Auto Workers: The Birth and Transformation of a Union, Gindin (1995, 264) observed that in cutting a different direction than the UAW, Canadian auto workers could not “wait for the American labor movement to revive itself. They could only continue their own struggle, insisting that unions remain independent working-class organizations and arguing that, with corporations more aggressive than ever before, the last thing unions should adopt is the illusion of false partnerships.”

After leaving the union, Gindin continued to write on union and workplace struggles. This often took the form of widely-circulated political interventions in pamphlets and e-journals – on unions in the auto industry “overcoming the destructive logic of competitiveness” and “extending unionization [that] develops the institutional confidence to bargain and engage politically” (Gindin 2004, 15); on “bringing class back in” as “success in defending and advancing the lives of working people will require new forms of working class organizations beyond unions” (Gindin 2015, 6); and the new possibilities for radical action demanded from unions and workers as “serious prospects for job security now lie in moving beyond collective bargaining and instead on [workers] integrating their productive skills into the project of industrial conversion” (Gindin et al. 2020, 31).

Despite the important struggles waged by the auto workers and other unions against concessions and neoliberal policies, including the Days of Action work shutdowns in the province of Ontario in the late 1990s, it became clear to Gindin that the setbacks of the North American working class could not easily be reversed by existing union and socialist forces and strategies. Out of the ashes of working-class defeats, capitalism was re-establishing itself in new deeper ways through financialization and global value production chains. Moreover, Gindin argued that the U.S. was not in economic decline as suggested in many popular and leftist accounts, but rather was leading the reorganization of capitalism globally in unprecedented ways, notably through liberalized trade arrangements in North America, Europe, East Asia, and globally through the World Trade Organization. Further, the U.S. was superintending the integration of the old Soviet bloc countries, as well as China and Vietnam, into the global circuits of accumu-

lation. The fragmentation and weakness of working-class movements in this period were as global as the world market was expansive (Gindin 2000; Panitch and Gindin 2003).

Gindin turned his attention to this new phase of “neoliberal globalization” in conjunction with Leo Panitch, through a series of essays on the “new imperialism” and “empire” and in their prize-winning book, *The Making of Global Capitalism* (2012). At the center of their account was the uniqueness of the structural capacities of the American state and the degrees of freedom its ruling classes had in their field of operations from the defeats and political disorientation of the U.S. working classes. This gave the dollar even greater strength as the global hub currency as U.S. capital “restructured key production processes, outsourced others to cheaper and more specialized suppliers ... all as part of an accelerated general reallocation of capital within the American economy” (Panitch and Gindin 2012, 16). Thus, it was the U.S. Federal Reserve and Treasury, as much as the Pentagon, that was actively constructing the extra-market institutional infrastructure of a unique global set of market rules, protections to financial assets and private property rights, and inscribing its favored economic policy practices into multilateral institutions. Foreign capital – and even the practices of the American state – was not being externally imposed but internalized inside states across the world market. As they argue:

The US informal empire constituted a distinctly new form of political rule. Instead of aiming for territorial expansion along the lines of the old empires, US military interventions were primarily aimed at preventing the closure of particular places or whole regions of the globe to capital accumulation. This was part of a larger remit of creating openings for or removing barriers to capital in general, not just US capital. The maintenance and indeed steady growth of US military installations around the globe after World War II, mostly on the territory of independent states, needs to be seen in this light rather than in terms of securing territorial space for the exclusive US use of natural resources and accumulation by its corporations. (Panitch and Gindin 2012, 11–12)

For Gindin, this unprecedented set of developments provided an entirely new terrain for socialist organizing and strategy. Capitalism, most often now accompanied by American

power in one form or another, had seeped into every corner of the globe, while in contrast traditional left organizing, whether in the form of communist or social democratic parties, had all but disappeared or become irredeemably compromised with bourgeois political forces.

The twentieth-century roads to socialist futures through alliances with national political classes – often now re-invoked by reference to an emergent multi-polar world order – are blocked, and it is doubtful they were ever feasible paths in the first place. Such strategies, Gindin argues, have too often been premised on the flawed notion that capitalism gives birth to socialism, an idea carried forward in today's projections that socialization is imminent in full automation. In contrast, Gindin (2021, 297) argues “the dilemmas facing the socialist project cannot be conjured away by overstating the usefulness to socialism of what will be inherited from capitalism.” If structural reforms and a series of political ruptures are required, the thinking through, and experiments with, the transformation of the state and means of production must have a “constant praxis that fosters socialist education, consciousness, and culture” (Gindin 2021, 301). The transformation of the means of administration and fostering of popular governing capacities is as important as the socialist political program for extending democratic planning, building workers' control in workplaces, radically reducing work-time, extending and democratizing social provisioning, controlling credit and capital movements, industrial conversion to production for need and ecology, and so forth. The difficulty facing the left today, Gindin argues, is that there exist only “polarized options” with a hard right that keeps gaining ground and a left that remains fragmented and isolated from working class politics. As Gindin (2021, 175) observes: “The challenge is to conceive of reforms that change the terrain of the struggle, contribute to working-class formation, educate and ... raise larger questions and possibilities.”

Like his closest colleague Leo Panitch, Gindin has often invoked just such a “revolutionary optimism of the intellect” – the possibilities that open with struggle and the

confidence that people then gain to confront and challenge capitalism. In this, Gindin has been one of North America's most notable organic intellectuals of the labor movement committed equally to advancing working class political struggles, socialist theory, and political engagements.

GREG ALBO AND ALAN ZUEGE

References

- Gindin, Sam. 1995. *The Canadian Auto Workers: The Birth and Transformation of a Union*. Toronto: James Lorimer.
- Gindin, Sam. 2001. “Turning Points and Starting Points: Brenner, Left Turbulence and Class Politics.” In *Socialist Register 2001: Working Classes Global Realities*, edited by Leo Panitch, Greg Albo, and David Coates, 343–66. London: Merlin Press.
- Gindin, Sam. 2004. *The Auto Industry: Concretizing Working Class Solidarity: Internationalism Beyond Slogans*. Toronto: Socialist Project Socialist Interventions Pamphlets, at www.socialistproject.ca.
- Gindin, Sam. 2015. *Global Issues: Bringing Class Back In*. Toronto: Socialist Project Socialist Interventions Pamphlets, at www.socialistproject.ca.
- Gindin, Sam, et al. 2020. *Take the Plant, Save the Planet: The Struggle for Community Control and Plant Conversion at GM Oshawa*. Toronto: Socialist Project Socialist Interventions Pamphlets, at www.socialistproject.ca.
- Gindin, Sam. 2021. “Notes Toward a Plausible Socialism.” In *State Transformations: Classes, Strategy, Socialism*, edited by Greg Albo, Stephen Maher, and Alan Zuege, 293–315. Leiden: Brill.
- Gindin, Sam. 2022. “American Workers and the Left After Trump: Polarized Options.” In *Socialist Register 2022: New Polarizations, Old Contradictions: The Crisis of Centrism*, edited by Greg Albo, Leo Panitch, and Colin Leys. London: Merlin.
- Panitch, Leo and Sam Gindin. 2003. “Global Capitalism and American Empire.” In *Socialist Register 2004: The New Imperial Challenge*, edited by Leo Panitch and Colin Leys, 1–42. London: Merlin.
- Panitch, Leo and Sam Gindin. 2012. *The Making of Global Capitalism: The Political Economy of American Empire*. London: Verso Books.

See also

Leo Panitch; Socialism; Marxism

170. Gorz, André

André Gorz (b. Vienna, February 9, 1923 – d. Vosnon, September 22, 2007), pseudonym of Gerhard Horst, was an Austro-French philosopher, journalist, and novelist. His father, Robert Hirsch, a Jewish entrepreneur who converted to Christianity, had changed his family name to Horst in 1930 alarmed by the growing antisemitic atmosphere in Austria (Gianinazzi 2016, 10–13). Gorz was a polyhedral and influential intellectual. He played an important editorial role in *Les Temps Modernes*, a prominent journal in the French and European philosophical scene, in which Jean-Paul Sartre, Simone de Beauvoir, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, and many other leading intellectuals collaborated. Moreover, Gorz's work had a notable impact on the New Left movement, especially his original theorizing on anti-authoritarianism and ecology.

After a scientific education in chemical engineering at the University of Lausanne (1945), Gorz moved to Paris, where he began his work as a journalist, using the pseudonym "Michel Bosquet." During the 1950s, Gorz came into contact with Sartre, Marxism, and the themes of critical political theory. In 1958, he published his first novel *The Traitor* (Gorz 2022 [1958], with a preface written by Sartre), which is an autobiographical account that intertwines an existentialist narrative with philosophical and political themes. This early period is marked by Gorz's confrontation with Sartrean Marxism (Bowring 2000, 32–115). In the text *La morale de l'histoire* (Gorz 1959), he criticizes the progressive philosophy of history shared by many orthodox Marxists. The political and theoretical core of the text, however, is a critique of economic structures. These structures become increasingly complex and autonomous: their domination spreads from the factory to the whole of society and lastly to everyday life (Bosquet 1973).

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, Gorz became a leading intellectual for the New Left movement. During these years, he approaches the student and environmental movements. During this period, Gorz was strongly influenced by Italian workerism and Marcuse's critical theory. Also essential to his ecological reflection is Ivan Illich's (2001 [1973]) text on the *Tools of Conviviality*. Through Illich's work, Gorz elaborates an

original and critical reflection on technique and technology. From this perspective, "the techniques on which the economic system is based are not neutral." Rather, it "is the matrix in which the distribution of power, the social relations of production, and the hierarchical division of labor are embedded" (Gorz 1980 [1978], 18–19).

However, today Gorz is generally known for his original political reflections on ecological issues. His ecological-political reflections began in 1973 with the publication of two articles, *Critique de la division du travail* (Gorz 1973) and *Critique du capitalisme quotidien* (Bosquet 1973). In 1975, he published *Écologie et politique* (*Ecology as politics*), a collection of articles previously published in *Le Sauvage* and *Le Nouvel Observateur*. His most important text of this period is *Ecology and Freedom* (Gorz 1977), which was later incorporated into the second edition of *Ecology as Politics* (Gorz 1980 [1978]).

Gorz's reflection radically stresses the close link between the ecological crisis and the contradictions of the capitalistic mode of production. Ecology thus ceases to be only the natural science that studies the relations between living beings and the environment and therefore reveals its political dimension. It becomes an analytical and methodological tool necessary to understand the predatory logic of capital. Capitalistic production is based on an unlimited growth model centred on self-valorisation and the accumulation of capital. As Gorz wrote "capitalism has been the expression of economic rationality finally set free of all restraint" (Gorz 1989 [1988], 122). In contrast, political ecology calls for an alternative rationality based on a different relationship with nature, and awareness of the social and natural limits to the exploitation of both environmental resources and human labor.

Moreover, recognizing the political dimension of ecology makes it possible to avoid the risk of purely technocratic management of the ecological crisis (Gorz 1992, 16–21). According to Gorz, political ecology represents the project of a radical transformation of society (Leonardi 2015, 38), a liberation from productivism towards an ecosocialist democratic perspective. His political ecology is not just environmental ethics, but rather represents a radical critique of capitalist society (Leonardi 2017, 41), that "challenges the reasons ... contained in the logic of

capitalist accumulation” (Gorz 2012 [1994], p.110). From this perspective, ecology is not only politics, but also the pursuit of a different way of life.

The work of André Gorz has profoundly influenced scholars and activists, not only in connection with his ecological thought. In the last phase of his inquiry, he reflected on the transformations of capitalism and the role of information technology. Being influenced by the hacker world, Gorz grasped the ambiguity of informatics. The latter is regarded by him both as a new frontier of domination and as an unseen instrument of emancipation (Gorz 2018 [2008]). His last work, *Letter to D. A Love Story* (Gorz 2008 [2006]) is a long letter dedicated to his life partner Dorine, who suffers from a degenerative disease. The two died by suicide in 2007 in the village of Vosnon.

PAOLO MURRONE

References

- Bosquet, Michel. 1973. *Critique du capitalisme quotidien*. Paris: Galilée.
- Bowring, Finn. 2000. *André Gorz and the Sartrean Legacy: Arguments for a Person-Centred Social Theory*. London and New York: McMillan.
- Illich, Ivan, 2001 [1973]. *Tools for Conviviality*. London: Marion Boyars.
- Gianinazzi, Willy. 2016. *André Gorz: Une Vie*. Paris: La Découverte.
- Gorz, André, 2022 [1958]. *The Traitor*. New York: Random House.
- Gorz, André. 1959. *La Morale de l'histoire*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- Gorz, André. 1973. *Critique de la division du travail*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- Gorz, André [Bosquet, Michel]. 1977. *Écologie et liberté*. Paris: Galilée.
- Gorz, André. 1980 [1978]. *Ecology as Politics*, translated by Patsy Vidgerman and Johnathan Cloud. Boston: South End Press.
- Gorz, André. 1989 [1988]. *Critique of Economic Reason*, translated by Gillian Handyside and Chris Turner. London and New York: Verso.
- Gorz, André. 1992. “L’écologie politique entre expertocratie et autolimitation.” *Actuel Marx* 2, no. 12: 15–29.
- Gorz, André. 2012 [1994]. *Capitalism, Socialism, Ecology*, translated by Martin Chalmers. London and New York: Verso.
- Gorz, André. 2018 [2008]. *Ecologica*, translated by Chris Turner. London: Seagull Books London, Ltd.
- Gorz, André. 2008 [2006]. *Letter to D. A Love Story*, translated by Julie Rose. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Leonardi, Emanuele. 2015. “L’ecologia politica di André Gorz.” In André Gorz, *Ecologia e Libertà*, translated into Italian by Emanuele Leonardi, 9–25. Napoli-Salerno: Orthotes.
- Leonardi, Emanuele. 2017. *Lavoro Natura Valore. André Gorz tra marxismo e decrescita*. Napoli-Salerno: Orthotes.

See also

Environmental Theory and Ecology; Marxism

171. Gouldner, Alvin

Alvin W. Gouldner (b. July 29, 1920–d. December 15, 1980) was one of the leading American sociologists from the 1950s through the 1970s. Gouldner was born and raised in Bronx, New York. He completed his master's degree in sociology at Columbia University (1945) under the supervision of Robert McIver. He then worked with Robert K. Merton, who supervised his doctoral research in a gypsum plant in upstate New York. Gouldner earned his Ph.D. (1953) from Columbia University, while serving as an associate professor at Antioch College (1952–54). A year later, Gouldner published two books from his dissertation: *Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy* (1954a) – now a classic in the field of organizational sociology – and *Wildcat Strike* (1954b).

Gouldner took his first full-time, tenure-track position in sociology at Washington University, St. Louis in 1959. By this time, even though Gouldner had established himself as a leading scholar in organizational sociology, until his death in 1980 he was more concerned with sociological theory in general. Throughout this period, Gouldner's task was the development of a reflexive sociology which called for a greater awareness of how the infrastructural level of tacit assumptions (ontological, epistemological, and axiological) connects up with the technical level (the actual theories and methods being developed to explain some part of the social world). For example, Gouldner (1960) published the article "The Norm of Reciprocity," which was generally critical of functionalism for its naivete concerning the importance of social exchange in assuring social order. But this takes for granted the eternal stability of social exchange itself, and functionalists such as Parsons never asked what the starting mechanisms were that gave rise to exchange in the first place. Even so, Gouldner was critical not only of the lack of reflexivity of functionalists; he conducted further critical examinations of interpretive theory, critical theory, Marxism, and linguistically oriented theory (such as that of Habermas), and a searing examination of the field of sociology in its totality in *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology* (1970).

Gouldner's *Coming Crisis of Western Sociology* was, in essence, a product of the tumultuous 1960s, where a systematic questioning and repudiation of the establishment emerged in the guise of numerous social movements including women's rights, gay rights, civil rights, and racial equality, along with anti-war, university, and police protests. There was a general feeling of crisis and a belief that fundamental changes in society were underway and could not be contained by established institutions. Establishment politics and culture received withering criticism, and Talcott Parsons, the leading world sociologist through the 1960s, was the focal point of Gouldner's own sense of crisis in sociology and Western society. According to Gouldner, establishment sociology had become moribund with its fetish of objectivity and quantitative methods, and was moving towards a more liberative, critical, and interpretive model of theorizing consistent with the increasing emphasis being placed on subjectivity and empathic understanding (*Verstehen*). This postpositivist movement was represented by such microtheories as dramaturgy (Goffman), ethnomethodology (Garfinkel), and phenomenology (Schutz).

Three years later, Gouldner (1973) published a book titled *For Sociology* which consisted of some of his earlier journal articles along with some new and previously unpublished work. The first two chapters reprinted two of his important journal articles from the 1960s. The "Anti-minotaur" paper concerned the ways in which sociologists had contorted and misrepresented Weber's position on objectivity to perpetuate the destructive and untenable myth of a value-free sociology. The "Sociologist as partisan" paper was written in light of the success of a critical project which Gouldner had played a key role in initiating; namely, the dispelling of the myth of objectivity in sociology. This produced, by the late 1960s, an equally pernicious partisanship whereby sociologists now felt emboldened to openly declare allegiances with particular persons, programs, or organizations; that is, elevating noncognitive (e.g., emotional) elements while denigrating empirical evidence. This amounted to an unreflective embrace of the welfare state and the range of dispossessed persons and groups – the poor, prostitutes, the mentally ill, racial minorities, the incarcerated – who populated the state's growing client list. Howard Becker

and the Chicago School also became targets of Gouldner's ire. By proclaiming that they are taking the side of society's "underdogs," they are really setting themselves up as zoo-keepers and administrators for the welfare state, all the while accruing to themselves higher status and funding while doing little to alleviate the suffering of the masses. The rancor and agonistic struggle arising from this work was rather typical of Gouldner's incessant challenge to the sociological establishment and this was represented even more forcefully in Gouldner's responses to critics of *The Coming Crisis* in other parts of the book.

These themes of critique and renewal were continued with the launching in 1974 of the journal *Theory and Society*, which Gouldner founded and edited until his death in 1980. As Gouldner (1974) explained in the journal's first issue, *Theory and Society* aimed to bring together scholars who had both a firm grasp of philosophy and a healthy respect for empirical commitments without the sterility of method as an end in itself. By bringing philosophy back to sociology, which had pretty much been abandoned with Comte and early positivism, the rationality of social theory could be assured in the future. This would constitute a new objectivity, the theme of which would be extended through his "dark side of the dialectic" project until his untimely death (Gouldner 1976a, 1976b, 1979, 1980).

JAMES J. CHRISS

References

- Gouldner, Alvin W. 1953. "Industry and Bureaucracy." PhD Dissertation. Columbia University.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. 1954a. *Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. 1954b. *Wildcat Strike*. Yellow Springs, OH: Antioch Press.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. 1960. "The Norm of Reciprocity." *American Sociological Review* 25: 161-78.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. 1970. *Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*. New York: Avon.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. 1973. *For Sociology: Renewal and Critique in Sociology Today*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. 1974. "Toward the New Objectivity: An Introduction to *Theory and Society*." *Theory and Society* 1, no. 1: i-v.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. 1976a. "The Dark Side of the Dialectic: Toward a New Objectivity." *Sociological Inquiry* 46, no. 1: 3-15.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. 1976b. *Dialectic of Ideology and Technology: The Origins, Grammar, and Future of Ideology*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. 1979. *The Future of Intellectuals and the Rise of the New Class*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. 1980. *The Two Marxisms*. New York: Oxford University Press.

See also

Intellectuals; Critical Theory

172. Grant, Judith

Judith Grant is a Professor Emeritus in the Department of Political Science at Ohio University in Athens, Ohio. She earned her Ph.D. from Rutgers University in 1987, where she specialized in contemporary political theory and wrote her dissertation under the supervision of Dr. Stephen Eric Bronner. Dr. Grant joined the faculty of Ohio University in 2003 after moving from her former position at the University of Southern California where she was awarded tenure in 1993. She is the former Chair of Political Science (2012–17), the Women, Gender and Sexuality Program at Ohio University (2005–12), the Gender Studies Program at USC (1995–99), and the USC Center for Feminist Research (1998–99). Dr. Grant has chaired a total of three different departments and been the director of two interdisciplinary centers during the course of her career, including most recently, the Center for Law, Justice and Culture at Ohio University (2012–13).

As an interdisciplinary scholar/teacher, Dr. Grant's research specialties are nineteenth and twentieth-century European social, political, and critical theory, feminist theory, and cultural studies. She has been active as a teacher of undergraduate and graduate students. She (2020a) has supervised students in the Ohio University Honors Tutorial College (HTC), and initiated several mentoring programs for junior faculty while at Ohio University. Grant has led several summer study-abroad programs to Paris, France, where she taught comparative political theory, postcoloniality, and the politics of France.

Grant is known primarily for her research on feminism and Marxism. Her work on feminism has focused on second wave feminism. She (2020b) argues that feminism from the 1960s to 1980s has been theorized around three core concepts: experience, women-are-oppressed-as-women, and personal politics. In *Fundamental Feminism* (2020b), Grant criticizes experience as a foundational epistemology, but she also points to the ways this concept puts feminism firmly in the tradition of non-feminist critical theory, while pointing to pragmatism and Marxism as also having important and related debates about the concept (Grant 2015).

Grant has also published analyses of Marx's early work to argue that Marx pro-

vided for a theory of gender in his philosophical works apart from his critique of classical political economy. In her view, Marxian dialectical humanism focuses on man because women have been trapped in the home by patriarchy, and she argues that Marx contends that the inclusion of women into the "family of man" would be necessary to fulfill the requirements for becoming fully human (Grant 2005). Grant has also published work in cultural studies and on animal welfare (Grant and Parson 2016).

Grant is active in the American Political Science Association (APSA) and the Western Political Science Association (WPSA), where she has been a longtime participant and occasional organizer of the Feminist Theory Pre-Conference. She was co-editor of the *New Political Science* (2020–23), the official journal of the Caucus for a Critical Political Science. She also served as an associate editor of *Gender and Politics* (2016–19). Grant has been a member of the Caucus for Critical Political Science (formerly, the Caucus for a New Political Science) since she was a graduate student at Rutgers University. She has also been active in the Women's Caucus for Political Science within the APSA. She is currently Vice-President of the Ohio state conference of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and President of its state-wide Committee A, which deals with issues related to academic tenure and promotion.

Dr. Grant is the author of several books and articles on feminism and Marxism.

JUDITH GRANT

References

- Grant, Judith. 2005. "Gender in the Early Marx: The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844." *Rethinking Marxism* 7, no. 1 (January): 59–77.
- Grant, Judith. 2015. "Experience." In *The Oxford Handbook of Feminist Theory*, edited by Lisa Disch and Mary Hawkesworth, 227–46. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Grant, Judith. 2020a. "2020 Vision: Higher Education as a Public Good." In *Academe Blog: The Blog of Academe Magazine*. Available at <https://academeblog.org/2020/05/15/2020-vision-higher-education-as-a-public-good-part-1-of-3/>.
- Grant, Judith. 2020b. *Fundamental Feminism: Radical Feminist History for the Future*, revised 2nd edn. New York: Routledge.

Grant, Judith and Sean Parson, eds. 2016. *Political Theory and the Animal Human Relationship*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Further readings

Grant, Judith. 2006. "Andrea Dworkin and the Social Construction of Gender: A Retrospective." *Signs: A Journal of Women, Culture and Society* 31, no. 4 (Summer): 967–93.

Grant, Judith. 2016. *Representations of Political Resistance Emancipation in Science Fiction*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Grant, Judith. 2019. "Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844." In *Bloomsbury Companion to Marx*, edited by Jeff Diamanti, Andrew Pendakis and Imre Szeman, 9–14. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

See also

Feminist Critiques of Political Science; Critical Theory; Feminist Theory and the State; Marxism

173. Green, Philip

Philip Green (b. October 6, 1932, New York) is a critical theorist of democracy and equality and an outspoken public intellectual. He retired in 1998 as Sophia Smith Professor Emeritus at Smith College, where he joined the faculty in 1964. From 2000–09, Green was a Visiting Professor at the New School Graduate Center. He received his B.A. in History from Swarthmore College (1954) and a Master of Public Affairs (1961) and Ph.D. in Politics from Princeton University (1965).

As a political theorist, Green has consistently highlighted the conflict between American liberal democracy's egalitarian pretensions and the radically unequal existing system of economic and political power in America. Green (2014) has described this contradictory state of affairs as a "pseudo-democracy" and "representative oligarchy," which results in a political-economic system that is "in constant tension with itself." Green's work often draws on a Marxist tradition of ideology critique to expose how political power is wielded by elites through apparently non-political and cultural forms, such as scientific discourse and mass media. His first book, *Deadly Logic* (1966), exposed the allegedly scientific approach to the nuclear arms race advanced by strategic policy scholars and policymakers in the Cold War era as profoundly unscientific and inattentive to the deeper moral and political dimensions of the possibility of nuclear warfare. Subsequently, in his essay "Science, Government, and the Case of Rand: A Singular Pluralism" (see Green 2014), Green demonstrated that the Rand Corporation's relationship to the theorists of nuclear deterrence gave the lie to the conventional liberal pluralist notion that policy-making in the U.S. was open to all would-be participants on an equal basis.

The book and essay were among the seminal critiques of liberal pluralism developed in the social and professional ferment of the 1960s, which resulted in the creation of the Caucus for a New Political Science (CNPS) in the American Political Science Association. Green was a founding member of the CNPS. His essay on the Rand Corporation was followed by "I Have a Philosophy, You Have an Ideology: Is Social Criticism Possible?" (reprinted in Green 2014). In this essay, Green argued that philosophical arguments

grounded in ascertainable realities and logically demonstrable propositions distinguish genuine philosophical or empirical argument from the illusions of ideological thinking. Similarly, his second book, *The Pursuit of Inequality* (1981) focused on the "rationalization of inequality" by dissecting the ideological and racist pseudoscience behind claims that IQ scores represent genetic intellectual differences among classes and races, and he also assailed the naturalization of male dominance as supposedly inalterable.

In his essay "A Few Kind Words for Liberalism," which initially appeared in *The Nation* in 1992 (reprinted in Green 2014), Green calls attention to the crucial relationship between radicalism and liberalism. Liberals, he notes, too often stop short of genuine change and leave valuable reforms in the lurch. On the other hand, radicals may fail to recognize the importance, from John Stuart Mill forward, of liberalism's defense of individual rights, group rights, and human rights. An example of this attention to rights is Green's advocacy of "open borders" for the United States (see, Green 2014). This perspective also leads him, in the latter half of his career, to turn his attention to the ideological impact of popular media, from a feminist critique of cinematic representation in *Cracks in the Pedestal* (1998) to an account of the increasing consolidation and capture of media by anti-democratic forces in *Primetime Politics* (2005).

In sum, as a critical theorist of democracy and a democratic socialist, Green has argued not only that the oligarchic and democratic elements of representative democracy are in constant tension, but that a truly representative and accountable government must have input from participants at all levels of public life. He contends, therefore, that representative democracy and modern capitalism – which deepens social inequalities and thus undermines the foundations of political equality – are fundamentally incompatible (Green 1985, 1998). His attention to these destructive forces is matched by an equally urgent advocacy of mass protest (Green 1993). In those works, and in "In Defense of the State" from Sheldon Wolin's journal *democracy* (in Green 2014), Green emphasizes the need for individual, collective, and governmental action to sustain and fulfill the promises of democratic equality.

These commitments are manifest not only in his academic writing but also in contributions to journals and magazines such as *Socialist Register*, *Philosophical Journal Quarterly*, *Journal of Politics*, *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, *Dissent*, *Commonweal*, and *The New York Times Magazine*. With Robert Benewick, he is the editor of *The Routledge Dictionary of Twentieth Century Political Thinkers* (2nd edn, 1998) and with Sanford Levinson of *Power and Community* (1970). He served on the editorial board of *The Nation* from 1978–2018. Since 2018, he has posted a weekly blog, *Taking Sides*, on Medium, in which he confronts and analyses the unfolding disaster of democracy, world-wide and in the United States (see, takingsides.medium.com). This has been his central theme since the publication of “Farewell to Democracy” in *Logos: Journal of Modern Society and Culture* (reprinted in Green 2014).

Green is married to Dorothy Green, with whom he lives in New York City. He has two children, Laura Green, professor of English and Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies at Northeastern University, and Robert Green, a film and internet producer; and two grandchildren, Violet Green and Zed Green. His memoir, *Taking Sides: A Memoir in Stories* (2015), offers a nostalgic look back at the intellectual and political currents of mid-twentieth-century New York. He is also a recipient of the Charles A. McCoy Career Achievement Award, Caucus for a New Political Science (2002), Rockefeller Foundation Fellowship at Bellagio (1992), Rockefeller Foundation Fellowship Recipient for “Political Equality: Toward the Ideal of a Self-Governing Community” (1982), Visiting Fellow, Institute of Advanced

Studies, Princeton (1981–82), and National Endowment for the Humanities Fellow (1976–77).

LAURA GREEN

References

- Green, Philip. 1966. *Deadly Logic: The Theory of Nuclear Deterrence*. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.
- Green, Philip and Sanford Levison. 1970. *Power and Community: Dissenting Essays in Political Science*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Green, Philip. 1981. *The Pursuit of Inequality*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Green, Philip. 1985. *Retrieving Democracy: In Search of Civic Equality*. Washington, D.C.: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Green, Philip. 1993. *Democracy: Key Concepts in Political Theory*. Amherst, NY: Humanity Books.
- Green, Philip. 1998. *Cracks in the Pedestal: Ideology and Gender in Hollywood*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Green, Philip. 1998. *Equality & Democracy*. New York: The New Press.
- Green, Philip. 1998. *The Routledge Dictionary of Twentieth-Century Political Thinkers*, with Bob Benewick, 2nd edn. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Green, Philip. 2005. *Primetime Politics: The Truth about Conservative Lies, Corporate Culture, and Television Culture*. Washington D.C.: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Green, Philip. 2014. *American Democracy: Selected Essays*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Green, Philip. 2015. *Taking Sides: A Memoir in Stories*, Amherst, MA: Levellers Press.

See also

Democracy; Ideology Critique; Critique of Pluralism

174. Guattari, Félix

Pierre-Félix Guattari (b. April 30, 1930–d. August 29, 1992) was born near Colombes, France and died at the La Borde Clinic in Cour-Cheverny, France, where he studied and worked for most of his life. Guattari initially worked under the guidance of La Borde's founder, Dr. Jean Oury, whom he met at the age of 15, and later, under psychoanalyst Jaques Lacan (Genosko 1996; Kirkup 1992). Perhaps best known for his collaboration with Gilles Deleuze, whom he first met in 1969, Félix Guattari's own contribution to critical political science spans far beyond this legendary partnership. Guattari was an experimental schizoanalyst, intellectual, communist, anti-fascist, environmentalist, and political activist, participating in the May '68 protest actions in France (Genosko 1996; Shatz 2010).

In their collaborative work, which is linguistically unique, indelibly complex, and conceptually inventive, it is almost impossible to distinguish where Deleuze's thoughts end and Guattari's begin and vice versa. Deleuze attributes the entirety of the idea of "the machine" as a way to circumvent the structuralist problematic to Guattari (Dosse 2010). In collaboration with Deleuze, Guattari wrote *Anti-Oedipus* (1972), *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature* (1975), *A Thousand Plateaus* (1980), and *What is Philosophy* (1991). In *Anti-Oedipus*, Deleuze and Guattari criticized Freudian and Lacanian psychoanalytic misunderstandings of desire as rooted in lack, which in Deleuze and Guattari's estimation, made psychoanalysis susceptible to both fascist alliance and capitalist (individualizing) cooptation. In short, desire constitutes a positive, collective, and experimentally liberatory force (Deleuze and Guattari 1985; Shatz 2010).

In a lesser-known work, *Communists Like Us*, Guattari and Antonio Negri (1985, 39) collaborated to give a poststructuralist defense of communism as it relates to subjectivity. In this book, Guattari wrote that "communism is the most intense experience of subjectivity, the maximization of the processes of singularization – individuation which represents the capability of our collective stock." In his own work, Guattari targets the relationship between capitalism, subjectivity, and the environment (and materiality in general)

in an effort to offer experimental political strategies for escaping the capitalist enclosure of selfhood and environmental destruction. In his popular *The Three Ecologies* (1989), Guattari argues in favor of a revolution of the mental, social, and environmental ecologies (i.e., subjectivities or milieus), which are collectively entangled with political possibilities untainted by capitalist desire. Guattari is conceptually responsible for not only the idea of "the machine," but also "schizoanalysis" and "transversality." Schizoanalysis was the primary psychiatric model while Guattari was director of La Borde. It is the liberation of desire from the search for structure, and from the Freudian and Lacanian models of selfhood, which ensnare desire, foster individuation, and ally themselves with the production of capitalist subjectivities. In short, schizoanalysis analyses the ways in which capitalist desire invades subjectivity, whilst theorizing possible mental and political escape routes away from this capture. Transversality also constituted a method designed to experiment upon subjectivity through disrupting institutional organizing principles via milieu shifts, role reversals, and unpredictable schedules at La Borde in order to rupture sense and self (Guattari 1992; Dosse 2010). A self-proclaimed ecosophist, Guattari was also deeply concerned with the fate of the planet in relation to subjectivity and capitalism. In addition to *The Three Ecologies* (1989), Guattari wrote five other books, including *Chaosmosis: An Ethico-Aesthetic Paradigm* (1992) on this topic.

Guattari's intellectual contributions to critical political science are inseparable from his experimental political activism. He helped create two Paris radio stations that espoused left-wing viewpoints in the 1970s (Riding 1992). Moreover, he was deeply involved with the French collective experimental research-organizations FGRI and its subsidiary CERFI (Goffey 2011). One of CERFI's publications, *Recherches*, published a number of controversial issues, including one now infamous issue entitled "Three Billion Perverts on the Stand," which presented perspectives on and experiences of homosexuality. French authorities banned the issue, and Guattari was arrested and tried by a French court for "affronting public decency" (Genosko 1996, 7). Notably, Michel Foucault testified in Guattari's defense. In his own defense, Guattari (1996, 216) called

homosexuality an “opening into Difference.” At the trial, Guattari (1996, 218) states that “at issue is the definition of what sexuality would be in a society freed from capitalist exploitation and the alienation that engenders all levels of social organization.” Guattari also loved cinema, radio and any sense of communication or material experimentation that could seemingly be “employed” in the service of the production of singularity and desire ruptured from and untethered to the capitalist machine. In the last years of his life, Guattari was also a supporter of the Green Party in France. He ran for regional election in an attempt to unite the Greens and Generation Ecologie parties in March of 1992, shortly before his death (Kirkup 1992; Riding 1992).

Guattari’s contributions to critical political science continue to be reflected in the work of new materialists, queer theorists, and environmental political theorists. Critical political science would benefit from greater attention to his work, particularly his understanding of subjectivity’s integral role in anti-capitalist, anti-fascist, and pro-environmental struggles.

C.L. WELKER

References

- Deleuze, Gilles. and Félix Guattari. 1983. *Anti-Oedipus: Introduction to Schizoanalysis*. New York: Routledge.
- Dosse, François. 2010. *Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari: Intersecting Lives*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kirkup, James. 1992. “Obituary: Felix Guattari.” *The Independent*, August 31. www.independent.co.uk/news/people/obituary-felix-guattari-1548642.html.
- Genosko, Gary. 1996. *The Guattari Reader*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishing, Ltd.
- Goffey, Andrew. 1992. “Translator’s Introduction.” In *Lines of Flight: For Another World of Possibilities*, by Félix Guattari, ix–xvi. New York: Bloomsbury.
- Guattari, Félix. 1992. *Chaosmosis: An Ethico-Aesthetic Paradigm*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Guattari, Félix. 1996. “Three Billion Perverts on the Stand.” In *The Guattari Reader*, edited by Gary Genosko, 185–92. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Guattari, Félix. 2000. *The Three Ecologies*. London: The Athlone Press.
- Guattari, Félix. 2016. *A Love of UIQ*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Guattari, Félix. and Negri, Antonio. 1990. *Communists Like Us: New Spaces of Liberty, New Lines of Alliance*. New York: Semiotext (e).
- Riding, Alan. 1992. “Felix Guattari, a Psychoanalyst and Philosopher, Is Dead at 62.” *New York Times*, September 3. www.nytimes.com/1992/09/03/arts/felix-guattari-a-psychoanalyst-and-philosopher-is-dead-at-62.html.
- Shatz, Adam. 2010. “Desire was Everywhere.” *London Review of Books*, 32, no. 24, December 16. www.lrb.co.uk/the-paper/v32/n24/adam-shatz/desire-was-everywhere.

See also

Post-Structuralism; Postmodernism; Communism; Gilles Deleuze; Michel Foucault; Genealogy

175. Habermas, Jürgen

Jürgen Habermas (b. Dusseldorf, Germany 1929–present) is arguably the best known scholar among the second generation of the Frankfurt School, an interdisciplinary, Marxist-oriented Institute for Social Research founded in Frankfurt, Germany in 1929. Although Habermas's father was a Nazi Party member, and urged the young Habermas to join the Hitler Youth and fight for the Nazis, the Nuremberg trials convinced Habermas to dedicate his life to creating a democratic philosophy that could undergird a new society. In 1946, he began to study philosophy and sociology first at the University of Bonn and then, in 1956 at the University of Frankfurt under the guidance of Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno. Following a dispute over his dissertation research and political radicalism, Habermas relocated to the University of Marburg, where he eventually took his *Habilitation* in political science under Wolfgang Abendroth. He became a *privatdozent* at Marburg in 1961.

In 1962, Habermas received an “extraordinary professorship” at the University of Heidelberg with the support of Hans-Georg Gadamer and Karl Lowith. Habermas returned to Frankfurt in 1964 and now with Adorno's blessing assumed the chair that had once been held by Horkheimer. From 1971–83, Habermas directed the Max Planck Institute at Starnburg, and then returned to Frankfurt to direct the Institute for Social Research, where he would remain until he retired in 1993. In 1986, Habermas received the Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Prize of the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft*, the highest honor for German research. He also became a permanent visiting professor at Northwestern University in the United States and began splitting the academic year between Frankfurt and Northwestern universities. Now in his nineties, Habermas continues to speak and write, most recently on the cultural and democratic deficits of the European Union (2012) and religious influences in secular societies (2019).

Habermas is arguably best known for his writings on the public sphere, communicative rationality, and deliberative democracy. For a critical political science, his quasi-Marxist concept of legitimation crisis is also important. Throughout his many writ-

ings, Habermas challenges first generation Frankfurt School intellectuals, including Adorno and Horkheimer. He argues that their overwhelmingly negative critiques of the self-destructiveness of Enlightenment reason are too one-sidedly focused on instrumental rationality. As a result, their critiques involve a performative contradiction: if instrumental rationality is so all encompassing, how are their critiques of it even possible? Although Habermas acknowledges the horrors created by highly technological and instrumental rationality in modern Western societies, he maintains that another – communicative – rationality persists. His various writings reconstruct the history and potential of this “other” reason.

In his early work, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* (1962), Habermas explores how the political public sphere emerged from intellectual and literary public spaces, more specifically, the coffeehouse and salon culture of a rising middle class in Western Europe. This work introduces themes that Habermas would later emphasize, such as the distinction between the lifeworld (private and public spaces of meaning creation) and the economic and political systems of democratic societies whose administrative imperatives too often colonize and coopt democratic processes of opinion formation. In two early articles (1970a, 1970b), Habermas developed criteria for the “ideal speech situation,” a linguistic rendition of the principles of equality, freedom, and justice in which speech is only constrained by the “forceless force of the better argument.” Habermas's magnum opus, the two volume *Theory of Communicative Action* (1981) further develops the conditions for democratic opinion formation by outlining the basic features of modern societies, such as deceleration, individuation, juridification, and universalization that enable communicative rationality. Habermas argues that speech acts are performative, their ultimate goal is mutual understanding, and speakers assume a responsibility to fulfill validity claims to truth, rightness, and sincerity. These arguments would become crucial for other theorists of deliberative democracy. Habermas also explores the emergence of new social movements on the “seam” between the lifeworld and economic and political systems. These movements, he

claims, carry the potential to reconnect processes of democratic opinion formation with state policies. However, new social movements can be regressive or progressive, and only the latter movements carry forward the promise of “bourgeois-socialist liberation.”

Although Habermas’s earlier *Legitimation Crisis* (1973) remains relatively obscure by comparison to his other works, it becomes important in this context. In *Legitimation Crisis*, he anticipated recurrent failures of capitalist markets and citizens’ loss of meaningful participation in democratic processes. Both phenomena, he thought, could lead either to a politically demobilizing motivation crisis or a resurgence of political activity in the public sphere. In *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy* (1992), his next major work after the *Theory of Communicative Action*, Habermas is less confident regarding the transformative potential of new social movements. He now argues that such movements at best serve as a “sluice” or channel between dominant systems and the lifeworld. Some scholars argue that Habermas concedes too much control to capitalism and liberalism in this work, and in the process undermines his earlier claims on behalf of communicative rationality. Most recently, Habermas completed an extensive and as yet untranslated history of philosophy, *Auch eine Geschichte der Philosophie* (2019) that examines processes of secularization. Here he also considers the persistence of ritual as indicative of an “awareness of what is missing” (2005) and a reassertion of cultural pluralism in modern Western society.

Given his early differences with Adorno and Horkheimer, it seems rather ironic that many scholars criticize Habermas’s philosophy as insufficiently radical. Critics have argued that Habermas concedes too much to instrumental or systems rationality, minimizes the impact of chronic economic crises on liberal capitalist societies, overestimates the potential of humanity for mutual understanding, presumes a singular Western Eurocentric path to modernity, neglects alternative communication styles of oppressed groups, and subsumes culturally diverse groups under a unitary concept of the public sphere. This is only a partial list of the criticisms made of his work. What seems most important is that Habermas continues seriously to engage

with his critics and to revise his theories accordingly. Even as the shadow of instrumental rationality deepens and widens across the globe, Habermas remains committed to the lingering possibility that the fundamental principles of deliberative democracy might eventually be realized in political practice.

NANCY S. LOVE

References

- Habermas, Jürgen. 1970a. “On Systematically Distorted Communication.” *Inquiry* 13, no. 3: 205–18.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1970b. “Towards a Theory of Communicative Competence.” *Inquiry* 13, no. 4: 360–75.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1975 [1973]. *Legitimation Crisis*, translated by Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1984 [1981]. *Theory of Communicative Action, Vol. I – Reason and the Rationalization of Society*, translated by Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1985 [1981]. *Theory of Communicative Action, Vol. II – Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason*, translated by Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1991 [1962]. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, translated by Thomas Burger. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1996 [1992]. *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*, translated by William Rehg. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 2012 [2011]. *The Crisis of the European Union: A Response*, translated by Ciaran Cronin. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 2019. *Auch eine Geschichte der Philosophie*. Berlin: Suhrkamp.
- Habermas, Jürgen and Joseph Ratzinger. 2007 [2005]. *The Dialectics of Secularization: On Reason and Religion*, translated by Brian McNeil. New York: Ignatius Press.

Further readings

For a comprehensive bibliography that includes Habermas’s replies to his critics, see: <https://contemporarythinkers.org/jurgen-habermas/bibliography>.

See also

Crises of Capitalism; Ideology Critique; Deliberative Democracy

176. Hall, Stuart

Stuart Hall (February 3, 1932–February 10, 2014) was born in Jamaica but lived most of his life in England. Questions of identity and belonging thus played a predominant role in his political development. His parents aspired for acceptance by their white peers, but Hall was marked at an early age for having the darkest complexion amongst his family members. His emigration to England, upon winning a Rhodes scholarship to study at Oxford University, was celebrated as an escape from the oppressive confines of double consciousness. This experience gave Hall an understanding of identity as something that was constantly shifting and composed of internal contradictions. His (1980a) most famous adage “race is the modality in which class is lived” demonstrates the importance of race for a more thoroughgoing analysis of class struggle. Race is one of the principle means in which social formations articulate structures of hierarchy and dominance. In his lecture “Race, The Floating Signifier” he rejects biological accounts of race realism but also shows why such views easily sneak back into commonly held cultural beliefs and practices (Hall 1997). Even though racial biological difference is not real, racism, race relations, and racial social differences are a constitutive aspect of political struggle.

The New Left was born in 1956 from twin events initiated by imperial rivals: the repression of the Hungarian revolution by the Soviet Union and the invasion of the Suez Canal by France and the United Kingdom (*New Left Review* 2010). For Hall, the 1958 Notting Hill race riots were also a figurative moment. In response to these events, Hall would help establish the journal *Universities and Left Review*. This journal was merged with *The New Reasoner* to create the *New Left Review*, with Hall serving as its first editor. Even after resigning from the *New Left Review*, Hall continued to bear the hallmark of this experience, often working in collaboration with teams, perfecting the essay-form, issuing continuous commentaries upon current events, and frequently making use of multimedia to attract a popular audience.

By the mid-1960s, Hall joined the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies at the University of Birmingham, eventually serving as director. Hall (1980b) became one

of the early originators of the nascent field of cultural studies. Hall believed that popular media and culture played a vital role in politics and therefore deserved serious study. Hall would author studies of cinema (1964), television (1973), journalism (1978), youth subcultures (1976), and the hippies (1968). For Hall, culture (thereby media as well) was the terrain in which politics was fought. His interest in contemporary cultural practices allowed him to intervene in debates over ideology by critical theorists and the New Left. Through a careful study of Karl Marx, from *The German Ideology* to *Capital*, Hall (1974/75) rejected theories of ideology reliant upon the base-and-superstructure metaphor. Cultural beliefs and practices are not reducible to economic class or false consciousness. The target of Hall’s (1985) opprobrium was the French philosopher Louis Althusser. Despite his stubborn and closed reading of Marxist dogma, Hall felt that Althusser had discovered a tension of grave importance. Social hierarchies are reproduced and articulated through ideological struggle. Hall turned to the Italian Antonio Gramsci and his notion of hegemony for a counter-position. Cultural ideas are the grounds in which politics is won or lost. Political analysis cannot be reduced to economic or structural explanations but must attend to ideological struggle and the complexity of historical conjunctures.

Hall’s most pronounced studies of history-as-it-happened was occasioned by the emergence of what is now called neoliberalism. The magisterial study *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State, and Law and Order* (1978) is less an account of economic ideas and more focused upon a crisis of authority. By analysing the appearance of the mugging label in British newspapers, Hall and his co-authors unearth a focused campaign by politicians, journalists, and police officials on behalf of law-and-order policies. The moral panic over mugging belied the more pressing political crisis underfoot: the popularity of social movements throughout the 1960s and 1970s. The crisis of authority was met with an authoritarian populist response. The rise of Thatcherism was pre-figured in attacks upon black, immigrant, and youth culture and appeals to police as the necessary prophylactic, and thus was not merely an economic ideology. Ultimately, Hall issues a historical account of how hegemony was won (by Thatcher and her

conservative allies) and the crisis within the left occasioned by this loss. *The Hard Road to Renewal: Thatcherism and the Crisis of the Left* (1988) compiles Hall's essays throughout the 1970s and 1980s as neoliberal hegemony was rigorously extended. Despite writing at a time of conservative ascendancy, one of Hall's foremost conclusions is that political struggle is without guarantees. The victory of reactionary political forces was not predetermined, and neither are future political struggles.

ANDREW JOHNSON

References

- Hall, Stuart. 1968. *The Hippies: An American 'Moment'*. Birmingham: Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies.
- Hall, Stuart. 1973. *Encoding and Decoding in the Television Discourse*. Birmingham: Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies.
- Hall, Stuart. 1974. "Marx's Notes on Method: A 'Reading' of the '1857 Introduction'". *Working Papers in Cultural Studies* 6: 132–70.
- Hall, Stuart. 1977. "Re-thinking the 'Base-and Superstructure' Metaphor." In *Class, Hegemony, and Party*, edited by J. Bloomfield, 43–72. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Hall, Stuart. 1980a. "Race, Articulation, and Societies Structured in Dominance." *Sociological Theories: Race and Colonialism*, 305–45. Paris: UNESCO.
- Hall, Stuart. 1980b. "Cultural Studies and the Centre: Some Problematics and Problems." *Culture, Media, Language: Working Papers in Cultural Studies, 1972–79*, edited by Stuart Hall, Dorothy Hobson, Andrew Lowe and Paul Willis, 2–35. London: Hutchinson.
- Hall, Stuart. 1985. "Signification, Representation, Ideology: Althusser and the Post-Structuralist Debates." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 2: 91–114.
- Hall, Stuart. 1988. *The Hard Road to Renewal: Thatcherism and the Crisis of the Left*. London: Verso.
- Hall, Stuart. 1997. "Race, The Floating Signifier." Media Education Foundation. Available at Stuart-Hall-Race-the-Floating-Signifier-Transcript.pdf (mediaed.org).
- Hall, Stuart. 2010. "Life and Times of the First New Left." *New Left Review* 61 (January/February): 177–96.
- Hall, Stuart and Paddy Whannel. 1964. *The Popular Arts*. London: Hutchinson.
- Hall, Stuart and Tony Jefferson. 1976. *Resistance Through Rituals, Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain*. London: Harper Collins.
- Hall, Stuart, Chas Critcher, Tony Jefferson, John Clarke, and Brian Roberts. 1978. *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State, and Law and Order*. London: Macmillan.

See also

Ideology; Critical Media Studies; Film Studies; New Left Review

177. Harrington, Michael

Michael Harrington (February 24, 1928–July 31, 1989) was America's leading socialist from the 1960s through the 1980s. When people referred to him with that label, Harrington would say "that's like being the tallest building in Topeka." During the Cold War, the socialist movement was a remnant of the once-vibrant movement that existed in the first half of the twentieth century, when socialist organizers and thinkers had a significant role in American politics and culture. Harrington sought to keep this flame alive in his writings, speaking, and organizing, including his leadership of the Socialist Party (SP) and later the Democratic Socialists of America (DSA).

For most of the 1950s, Harrington barely made a living from his work. He lived in voluntary poverty as a member of the Catholic Worker movement, sharing living space with homeless men in the Bowery district – New York City's skid row – and writing articles for small-circulation left-wing magazines. With his mentor Dorothy Day and others, Harrington joined and sometimes helped organize protests against the Korean War and nuclear arms, and for civil rights. Traveling by bus and thumb across the country, he spoke to small groups of students on college campuses as a representative of the Young People's Socialist League, the SP's youth arm. He spent many evenings at the White Horse Tavern in Greenwich Village, hanging out with poets, writers, folksingers, and radicals. However, by the early 1960s, Harrington was taking planes to Washington, D.C., invited by President Lyndon B. Johnson's top advisers to help develop a strategy to reduce poverty. He sat in on high-level meetings, drafted memos, and recommended policy ideas (Isserman 2000).

Harrington's journey from the White Horse to the White House started with the publication of his book *The Other America* (1962). Although he was neither an economist nor a sociologist, the book gave Harrington credibility as an expert on the most pressing economic and social issues of the day. One columnist called him "the man who discovered poverty," and the label stuck. The book became required reading for social scientists, elected officials and their staffs, college students, members of study groups sponsored by

churches and synagogues, reporters and intellectuals, the new wave of community organizers, and the student activists who traveled to the south to join the civil rights crusade. Harrington was soon in great demand as a speaker on college campuses, at union halls, and before religious congregations. Reporters and television talk-show hosts wanted to interview him.

Throughout his life Harrington walked a political tightrope, as both a reformer and a radical. He gave America a socialist conscience and socialism an American accent. The accent came from St. Louis, Missouri, where Harrington was raised in a middle-class Irish Catholic family. He attended Catholic schools, where he was popular and an accomplished student, where he edited the school paper and yearbook. He wanted to be a writer and a poet. At twenty-one, after fleeting experiences at Yale Law School and the University of Chicago in 1949, he moved to New York and soon joined the Catholic Worker movement.

After two years, Harrington decided that instead of ministering to the poor he wanted to work to abolish the system that produced so much misery. Harrington left the Catholic Worker. Several Old Left socialists tutored him in Marxism and groomed him for a public role, recognizing that his mid-western boyish charm and his fiery speaking style made him an emerging leader. But even in his twenties, Harrington rejected the tendency of his mentors to boil everything down to economics. He began writing for magazines like *Dissent*, *New Leader*, and *Commonweal* about war and politics but also about culture, movies, and novels. In the late 1950s and early 1960s, Harrington traveled to college campuses giving speeches about peace, civil rights, civil liberties, and other topics, meeting with small groups of activists, hoping to sign up recruits for the Young People's Socialist League (YPSL).

Few students joined the YPSL, however. Many of the most talented student activists formed the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) in 1960 and Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) in 1962. They admired Harrington, who was one of a handful of nonstudents invited to SDS' founding convention in Port Huron, Michigan that year. But Harrington angrily attacked the first draft of SDS's manifesto, the *Port Huron Statement*, written primarily by Tom

Hayden (2005 [1962]), a student leader at the University of Michigan. Harrington accused the manifesto of being inadequately critical of the Soviet Union and of American communism and too critical of the political complacency of many labor unions. Though Hayden and his coauthors revised the document to meet some of Harrington's concerns, Harrington's criticisms created a rift between him and many New Left leaders. Eventually, Harrington apologized and was back in the student radicals' good graces (Isserman 2000).

The Other America (1962) struck a nerve, in part, because the country was ready to hear its message. Economist John Kenneth Galbraith's 1958 best seller *The Affluent Society* expressed concern that there were still many Americans left out of the nation's prosperity. Edward R. Murrow's CBS television documentary *Harvest of Shame*, broadcast in 1960, had drawn attention to the plight of migrant farm laborers. That year, while campaigning for President, John F. Kennedy was shocked at the suffering he saw in West Virginia, where the poor were mostly rural whites. Kennedy started talking about the millions of Americans living in substandard housing and about the elderly living on inadequate incomes – statistics he probably got from Harrington's Commentary articles. After JFK took office, his economic adviser Walter Heller gave him a copy of Harrington's book, which came out in March 1962 (Isserman 2000).

It was not just good timing that made Harrington's book a hit with the public. His writing style – informal, accessible, morally outraged but not self-righteous – appealed to readers. *The Other America* challenged the conventional wisdom that the nation had become an overwhelmingly middle-class society as a result of postwar prosperity. He reported that almost one-third of all Americans lived “below those standards which we have been taught to regard as the decent minimums for food, housing, clothing and health” (Harrington 1962). “The fate of the poor,” he concluded, “hangs upon the decision of the better-off. If this anger and shame are not forthcoming, someone can write a book about the other America a generation from now and it will be the same or worse.” He added: “Until these facts shame us, until they stir us to action, the other America will continue to exist, a monstrous

example of needless suffering in the most advanced society in the world” (Harrington 1962).

Harrington was a committed socialist, but the word “socialism” did not appear in *The Other America* because he wanted the book to have a wide appeal. He wrote that poverty was caused and perpetuated by institutions and public policies, not by individuals' personal pathologies. But he did not argue that it was caused by capitalism or that the solution was socialism. The solution, he wrote, was full employment, more funding for housing and health care, and better schools and job training.

In February 1964, Harrington, labor activist Paul Jacobs, and U.S. Labor Department official Daniel Patrick Moynihan (later U.S. Senator from New York) wrote a background paper for Johnson's War on Poverty planning committee, led by Sargent Shriver. The memo argued: “If there is any single dominant problem of poverty in the U.S., it is that of unemployment” (Moynihan 1969). The remedy, it said, was a massive public works initiative similar to the New Deal's Works Progress Administration (WPA) and Civilian Conservation Corps programs. The War on Poverty legislation, passed in August 1964, included funds for preschool education, social services through community action agencies, and legal services, but included no major jobs programs and no major direct cash grants to the poor. Harrington complained to Shriver that America could not abolish poverty by spending “nickels and dimes.” Shriver responded, “Oh really, Mr. Harrington. I don't know about you, but this is the first time I've spent a billion dollars” (Isserman 2000, 211). The reality is that these policies (including Medicaid, subsidized housing, Head Start, legal services, and, later, food stamps), in combination with a strong economy, did significantly reduce poverty from the middle 1960s through the early 1970s.

Harrington also warned that campaigns for civil rights, union drives, and calls to withdraw US troops from Vietnam were not enough. They were necessary stepping-stones toward a better world, but they were not sufficient to end poverty, expand happiness, or stop imperialism. He told audiences, “You must recognize that the social vision to which you are committing yourself will never be fulfilled in your lifetime” (Dorrien 2021,

446). In the meantime, though, socialists, radicals, progressives, and liberals had to fight today for what he called the “left wing of the possible” (Isserman 2000, 304).

After years of being a freelance writer and itinerant speaker, in 1973 Harrington joined the political science department of Queens College in New York, while continuing his prolific writing and organizing. Although he wrote 11 more books, *The Other America* was Harrington’s calling card, and he used it to help build a “left wing of the possible” movement. Unlike Eugene Debs and Norman Thomas – his predecessors as the nation’s leading socialists – Harrington never thought it possible to create a radical third party that could succeed in electing candidates and gaining power. The task of socialists was to build coalitions among labor, civil rights, religious, intellectual liberals, and others to form a left flank within the Democratic Party (Harrington 1968, 1980). He worked closely with the leaders of the United Auto Workers, Service Employees International Union, the International Association of Machinists, and other unions. He wrote speeches for Ted Kennedy and Martin Luther King, Jr. and drafted a Poor People’s Manifesto for King in 1968 (Isserman 2000).

When Harrington died in 1989 at age 61, DSA had about 10,000 members. There were only a handful of socialists serving in public office. After he died, the socialist movement no longer had a well-known public figure who could attract media attention, inspire new generations of activists, and raise money from unions and progressives to keep DSA alive. By the early 2000s, DSA had declined to about 5,000 members. But widening inequality, persistent inequality, and the potential for climate catastrophe have given Harrington’s ideas a new life. The presidential campaigns of Senator Bernie Sanders in 2016 and 2020 popularized democratic socialism, particularly among young people. By 2022, DSA

had grown close to 100,000 members with 222 chapters around the country, with more than 100 members serving in public office, including Congressmember Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez. According to a 2019 Gallup poll, 43 percent of all Americans, and 58 percent of those between 18 and 34, believe that socialism would be a “good thing” for the United States.

PETER DREIER

References

- Dorrien, Gary. 2021. *American Democratic Socialism: History, Politics, Religion, and Theory*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Harrington, Michael. 1962. *The Other America: Poverty in the United States*. New York: Macmillan.
- Harrington, Michael. 1968. *Toward a Democratic Left: A Radical Program for a New Majority*. New York: Macmillan.
- Harrington, Michael. 1970. *Socialism*. New York: Saturday Review Press.
- Harrington, Michael. 1980. *Decade of Decision: The Crisis of the American System*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Hayden, Tom. 2005 [1962]. *Port Huron Statement: The Visionary Call of the 1960s Revolution*. New York: Thunder’s Mouth Press.
- Isserman, Maurice. 2000. *The Other American: The Life of Michael Harrington*. New York: Public Affairs.
- Moynihan, Daniel Patrick. 1969. *Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding: Community Action in the War on Poverty*. New York: Free Press.
- Younis, Mohamed, “Four in 10 Americans Embrace Some Form of Socialism,” Gallup, May 20, 2019 <https://news.gallup.com/poll/257639/four-americans-embrace-form-socialism.aspx>

Further readings

- Harrington, Michael. 1976. *The Twilight of Capitalism*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Harrington, Michael. 1989. *Socialism: Past and Future*. New York: Plume.

178. Hartsock, Nancy C.M.

Nancy Hartsock (1943–2015) was an American feminist philosopher and political theorist. She grew up in a lower-middle-class family in Ogden, Utah. In the early sixties, she attended Wellesley College and was involved in the Wellesley Civil Rights Group. She completed her undergraduate degree in political science at the University of Chicago, where she engaged with the student movements against the segregation of housing of Black Chicagoans and was part of the anti-war movement. Her early academic and activist work influenced the writing of her Ph.D. dissertation, “Politics, Ideology and Ordinary Language: The Political Thought of Black Community Leaders,” which she completed in 1972. While in Chicago, Hartsock worked with several feminist organizations and contributed to the journal *Quest: A Feminist Quarterly*.

In 1970, Hartsock was the first woman hired by the Department of Political Science at the University of Michigan. In 1973, she spent a sabbatical year in Paris, where she closely studied the political thought of Karl Marx, and in Washington DC, where she started to engage with the feminist group “Le Furies” and their ideas on lesbian feminism. She subsequently held academic positions at Johns Hopkins University, Stanford University, and Oberlin College. In 1984, Hartsock joined the Department of Political Science and Women Studies (now Gender, Women and Sexuality Studies) at the University of Washington, where she spent the remainder of her academic career until she passed away on March 19, 2015 in Seattle.

Hartsock’s work was concerned with the analysis of power and community to build the theoretical foundations of feminist historical materialism. In doing so, feminist theory was for her not a “set of specific conclusions about the situation of women,” but was instead “a mode of analysis that could be usefully applied to studying not simply women but society as a whole” (Hartsock 1998b, 402). Philosophically, Hartsock (1998b, 404) was influenced by Karl Marx, and she particularly appreciated his treatment of social phenomena as “processes” instead of as “things” as best exemplified by Marx’s dialectical

understanding of history and relations among social classes. However, Hartsock pointed out the gender-blindness of Marx’s theory, and she criticized him for not taking into account the sexual division of labor in society and women’s responsibility to bear children and work in the household.

In analysing societal relations and the idea of community, Hartsock’s book *Money, Sex and Power* (1985) presented a critique of several philosophical theories that understand society as markets populated by individuals engaging with each other exclusively to maximize their self-interest, and exchanging only within voluntary and equal relations. In contrast, Hartsock maintained that interactions among people are always part of a power struggle between social classes that need to be contextualized within historical moments and class constraints. Her analysis of society traced back the concept of individual identity postulated by theories that treat society as markets to the influence of patriarchal structure, masculinity, and sexuality. She criticizes the phallogocratic understanding of power, which she defined as a form of domination and the ability to impose one’s will over others. As an alternative, she proposed a conceptualization of power understood as energy, strength, and creation. As an example of this manifestation of power, she referred to the relationship between a mother and her child.

Hartsock’s work made a major contribution to the conceptualization of the feminist standpoint. The idea of “standpoint” postulates that some groups of society, even if well-intentioned, are not able to see the whole complexity of interactions among people because material life (e.g., hunger) determines limits to their understanding of social relations. Echoing Marx, Hartsock maintained that the epistemology of the ruling class is always partial and silences the perspectives of marginalized groups in society. However, while Marx claimed that a true understanding of society should start from the standpoint of the proletariat, Hartsock emphasized the importance of maintaining a standpoint based on the experience of women. This feminist standpoint was for her a way to understand patriarchal institutions and to pave the way for challenging and ultimately defeating them. Hartsock (1998a) reformulated her first definition of the feminist standpoint in her collection of essays, *The Feminist Standpoint*

Revisited, where she clarified the importance of women's class, race, and sexual orientation to pluralize the idea of standpoint and go beyond the dichotomy women-men.

The concept of feminist standpoint has been criticized by some scholars as biologically grounded and essentialist. To these and other critiques, Hartsock replied that an accurate understanding of Marxist philosophy should recognize the attention to history and context as a way of seeing the emergence of the standpoint within the dialectic, and not as an un-historically pre-given concept. Nevertheless, in her work, Hartsock criticized postmodernist theorists, such as Michel Foucault, because she claimed that these philosophies deconstruct other theories without providing alternatives and without attempting to change the power relations that they study. For Hartsock (1998a, 223), modernist and postmodernist philosophies misunderstand the purpose of theory because, paraphrasing Marx, the point of theory is "to change the world, not simply to redescribe ourselves or reinterpret the world yet again."

AUGUSTA NANNERINI

References

- Hartmann, Heidi, et al. 1996. "Bringing Together Feminist Theory and Practice: A Collective Interview." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 21, no. 4 (Summer): 917–51.
- Hartsock, Nancy. 1985. *Money, Sex, and Power: Toward a Feminist Historical Materialism*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Hartsock, Nancy. 1998a. *The Feminist Standpoint Revisited, and Other Essays*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Hartsock, Nancy. 1998b. "Marxist Feminist Dialectics for the 21st Century." *Science & Society*, 62, no. 3 (Fall): 400–13.
- Hartsock (Nancy C.M.) Papers. Brown University Library. <https://library.brown.edu/collatoz/info.php?id=416/>. Accessed February 10, 2023.
- Passing of Nancy Hartsock | Department of Political Science | University of Washington. www.polisci.washington.edu/news/2015/04/28/passing-nancy-hartsock. Accessed February 10, 2023.

See also

Feminist Critiques of Political Science; Gender; Feminist Theory and the State

179. Harvey, David

David Harvey (b. October 31, 1935–) is an eminent Marxist geographer, who is one of the most cited social scientists of the past four decades. Harvey (Ph.D., St. John's College, Cambridge University, 1961) is a Distinguished Professor of Anthropology and Geography at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York (CUNY). He was previously on the faculties of the University of Bristol (1961–69), Johns Hopkins University (1969–87, 1993–2001), and the University of Oxford (1987–93). After making landmark contributions to mainstream and quantitative geography early in his career, Harvey turned to Marx to explain the shifting political-economic landscape of U.S. cities in the wake of the urban crisis of the late 1960s. Thus began a lifelong project of developing a radical geographical and political-economic explanation of capitalism's logic and history.

Harvey's path-breaking works include *Social Justice and the City* (2009 [1973]), which contrasts liberal and Marxist understandings of urbanism; *The Limits to Capital* (2018 [1982]), a spatialized reading of Marx's masterwork; *The Condition of Postmodernity* (1989), which locates the origins of the postmodern cultural turn in the transition from Fordist to post-Fordist regimes of capital accumulation; *Justice, Nature, and the Geography of Difference* (1996), an engagement with constructivist and ecological thought to analyse how social processes produce difference; *Paris: Capital of Modernity* (2001), a historical-geographical exploration of Second Empire Paris; and *The New Imperialism* (2003), which argues that the U.S. invasion of Iraq was launched to maintain U.S. global economic hegemony through control of the world's oil supply.

Through these works, Harvey developed a spatialized conceptual vocabulary that has influenced a wide range of academic studies.

Notably, the concept of *time-space compression* captures the tendency for capital to intensify the circuits of accumulation through technological advancements in transportation and communications systems. This concept has been influential in the emerging field of global studies as a way of understanding the process of globalization. His concept of

the *spatial-fix* explains how the absorption of surplus capital in the built environment can stave off economic crisis and generate geographical conditions for new rounds of capital accumulation. *Accumulation by dispossession* updates Marx's concept of primitive accumulation to illustrate capitalism's continued dependence on expropriation, in addition to labor exploitation, for its extended reproduction.

Harvey's most direct impact on critical political science came with *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* (2005), which defined neoliberalism as a *political project* to restore capitalist class power in the wake of the 1970s economic crisis. Harvey's analysis highlights neoliberal ideology (anti-collectivism, anti-statism, and the sacrosanctity of individual economic freedoms) and its rise through the U.S. political apparatus. Harvey highlights the ideology's contradictions (for example, the state's active promotion of market logic across all of society, which runs contrary to neoliberalism's purported anti-statism). Additionally, Harvey maps out the uneven geographical development of neoliberalism as it has played out in different national contexts (Mexico, Argentina, Sweden, South Korea, and China). *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* concludes by speculating on the prospects of neoliberalism's demise and the potential rise of a political movement demanding democratic governance.

Criticisms of Harvey's work have centered on his neglect of the diverse, community-based, egalitarian, and democratic forms of economic activity and social organization taking place within and outside of broader capitalist structures. Harvey's lack of engagement with state theory has led to a persistent under-theorization of the state across his work. The relationship between capital, state, and society represents an area of study that critical political scientists are especially well-positioned to advance.

Harvey's more recent work has centered on the theorization of economic crisis (*The Enigma of Capital* 2010), the contradictions of capitalism (*17 Contradictions and the End of Capitalism* 2014), and a multivolume companion to Marx's *Capital* (2018). Harvey has continued to educate and inspire a new generation of radical scholars through his online

lecture series and podcast (see: davidharvey.org).

DEAN SNYDER

References

- Harvey, David. 1989. *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Harvey, David. 1996. *Justice, Nature, and the Geography of Difference*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Harvey, David. 2003. *Paris: Capital of Modernity*. New York: Routledge.
- Harvey, David. 2003. *The New Imperialism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, David. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, David. 2009 [1973]. *Social Justice and the City*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Harvey, David. 2010. *The Enigma of Capital and the Crises of Capitalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, David. 2014. *17 Contradictions and the End of Capitalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, David. 2018 [1982]. *The Limits to Capital*. New York: Verso.
- Harvey, David. 2018. *A Companion to Marx's Capital: The Complete Edition*. New York: Verso.

180. Hawkesworth, Mary

Mary Hawkesworth (b. June 26, 1952, USA) is an internationally recognized pioneer in critical research and scholarship situated at the intersection of the discipline of political science and the interdisciplinary field of women's and gender studies. She received her B.A. in Political Science (1974) (*Summa cum laude*) from the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, and her M.A. (1977) and Ph.D. (1979) in Political Science, both with Distinction, from Georgetown University. She held positions as an Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor at the University of Louisville from 1979–98. Since 1998, she has served as Professor of Political Science and Women's and Gender Studies at Rutgers University, where she currently serves as Distinguished Professor Emerita. At Rutgers, she served as the Director of the Center for American Women and Politics (1998–2001), Director of the Graduate Program in Women's and Gender Studies (2001–04), and Chair of the Department of Women's and Gender Studies (2007–10). In 2005, she successfully brought the leading journal in feminist scholarship, *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, to Rutgers and served as the journal's Editor in Chief for two terms (2005–15). Hawkesworth is also a founding member of the International Social Science Council Research Committee on Gender, Globalization, and Democratization.

Hawkesworth has the kind of scholarly breadth that is difficult to find among top scholars. She has written on subjects as wide-ranging as policy analysis, legislative studies, feminist theory, women and politics, epistemology, methodology, activism, advocacy, democratization, globalization, war and terror, mentorship, leadership, raced-gendered hierarchies, and intersectionality. In her acknowledgements in *Embodied Power: Demystifying Disembodied Politics* (2016), Hawkesworth describes being trained as a graduate student in the 1970s, required to pass qualifying exams in four fields: American politics, comparative politics, international relations, and political theory. Despite this breadth of training as a political scientist specializing in political philosophy, feminist theory, and philosophy of science, she does not recall serious examinations of race or gender. Hawkesworth has dedicated

her career as a critical political scientist to filling these gaps. She has availed herself of opportunities to work with outstanding scholars of color at home and abroad. She has worked with feminist scholars in the Black Caucus and Latino/a Caucus of the APSA and has twice won the Excellence in Mentoring Award from the Women's Caucus for Political Science. She is known for her mentorship of graduate students, younger women scholars, and scholars of color. The same kind of generosity of spirit that guides her work with her colleagues also guides her scholarly critiques.

Hawkesworth's scholarship encompasses the critical interpretation of both political texts and embodied social and political practices. Her ground-breaking work in feminist theory, women, gender, and politics, contemporary political philosophy, feminist methodologies, globalization, activism, and social policy has resulted in over 70 articles in the leading journals in the fields of political science and women's and gender studies: *American Political Science Review*; *Political Theory*; *Signs*; *Hypatia*; *Women and Politics*; *Journal of Women's History*; *NWSA Journal*; *International Journal of Women's Studies*; and *The Women's Studies International Forum*. Her article published in 2003 in the *American Political Science Review* (APSR), "Congressional Enactments of Race-Gender: Toward a Theory of Raced-Gendered Institutions," won the Heinz Eulau Prize for the Best Paper Published in the APSR that year. Using existing interviews with Congressional women of color, Hawkesworth (2003, 529) "advance(d) an account of racing-gendering as a political process that silences, stereotypes, enforces invisibility, excludes, and challenges the epistemic authority of Congresswomen of color."

Hawkesworth was the 2016 recipient of the Grain of Sand Award given by the Interpretive Methodologies and Methods related group of the American Political Science Association (APSA) to honor "a political scientist whose contributions to interpretive studies of the political, and, indeed, to the discipline itself, its ideas, and its persons, have been long-standing and merit special recognition." The citation for the Grain of Sand Award recognized Hawkesworth's 1988 *Theoretical Issues in Policy Analysis* for laying "the foundations for a robust critique of traditional

ways of thinking about policy studies and analysis” (Citation 2016).

Over a career spanning more than four decades, Hawkesworth has changed the way political scientists think about epistemology, what constitutes the political, and how intersectional bodies experience power under patriarchy. She took her “methodological and philosophical concerns into the world of what might be called *applied feminist critique* – examining strategies for overcoming oppression” (Citation 2016). The quality of her scholarship is matched by her prolific production. Hawkesworth has given over 200 conference presentations and invited lectures. Her close to 20 books include: *Beyond Oppression: Feminist Theory and Political Strategy* (1990); *Gender, Globalization and Democratization* (2001), co-edited with Rita Mae Kelly, Jane Bayes and Brigitte Young, translated into Romanian (2004); *Women, Democracy and Globalization in North America* (2006); *Globalization and Feminist Activism* (2006); *War and Terror: Feminist Perspectives* (2008); *Routledge Encyclopedia of Government and Politics* (1992, 2004), co-edited with Maurice Kogan; *Feminist Inquiry: From Political Conviction to Methodological Innovation* (2006); *War and Terror: Feminist Perspectives* (2008), edited with Karen Alexander; *Political Worlds of Women: Activism, Advocacy, and Governance in the 21st Century* (2012); *Oxford Handbook of Feminist Theory* (2015), co-edited with Lisa Disch; *Embodied Power: Demystifying Disembodied Politics* (2016); and her most recent work on *Gender and Political Theory: Feminist Reckonings* (2019). Hawkesworth has taught students of political science: (1) to question assumptions of value-free neutrality and objectivity; (2) to analyse the institutional and societal operation of gender power and the mutually constitutive structural powers of race, gender, class, ethnicity, sexuality, and nationality at all levels of analysis, including local, regional, and national governments, international organizations, and transnational NGOs; and (3) to use innovative and critical modes of inquiry to work to make the world a more inclusive place for all intersectional bodies.

JENNIFER LEIGH DISNEY

References

- Citation for Mary Hawkesworth, Interpretive Methodologies and Methods Conference Group @ APSA’s 2016, Grain of Sand Award, <https://connect.apsanet.org/interpretation/wpcontent/uploads/sites/60/2016/07/Citation-for-Mary-Hawkesworth.docx>.
- Hawkesworth, Mary. 1988. *Theoretical Issues in Policy Analysis*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Hawkesworth, Mary. 1990. *Beyond Oppression: Feminist Theory and Political Strategy*. New York: Continuum Press.
- Hawkesworth, Mary. 2003. “Congressional Enactments of Race-Gender: Toward a Theory of Raced-Gendered Institutions.” *American Political Science Review* 97, no. 4: 529–50.
- Hawkesworth, Mary. 2006. *Feminist Inquiry: From Political Conviction to Methodological Innovation*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Hawkesworth, Mary. 2006. *Globalization and Feminist Activism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Hawkesworth, Mary. 2012. *Political Worlds of Women: Activism, Advocacy, and Governance in the 21st Century*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Hawkesworth, Mary. 2016. *Embodied Power: Demystifying Disembodied Politics*. New York: Routledge.
- Hawkesworth, Mary. 2019. *Gender and Political Theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hawkesworth, Mary and Karen Alexander, eds. 2008. *War and Terror: Feminist Perspectives*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hawkesworth, Mary and Lisa Disch, eds. 2015. *Oxford Handbook of Feminist Theory*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Hawkesworth, Mary and Maurice Kogan, eds. 2004 [1992]. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Government and Politics*, 2 Vols. London: Routledge.
- Hawkesworth, Mary, Kayo Denda and Fernanda Perrone. 2018. *The Douglass Century: The Transformation of Women’s Education at Rutgers*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Hawkesworth, Mary, Rita Mae Kelly, Jane Bayes and Brigitte Young, eds. 2001. *Gender, Globalization and Democratization*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Hawkesworth, Mary, Rita Mae Kelly, Jane Bayes and Brigitte Young, eds. 2004. *Gen, Globalizare și Democratizare*. Translated by Alina Pilea and Nadia Farcaș into Romanian. Bucharest: Editura POLIROM.

Hawkesworth, Mary, Jane Bayes, Patricia Begné, Laura Gonzalez, Lois Harder, and Laura MacDonald, eds. 2006. *Women, Democracy and Globalization in North America*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hawkesworth, Mary, Jane Bayes, Patricia Begné, Laura Gonzalez, Lois Harder, and Laura MacDonald. 2006. *Women, Democracy, and Globalization in North America: A Comparative Study*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

181. hooks, bell

Gloria Jean Watkins (1952–2021), better known by her pen name bell hooks, was a feminist, academic, social critic, and activist. She is known for interrogating the intersections of gender, race, sex, and class, with a specific focus on Black women, and was a leader in Black feminist thought. hooks was a prolific writer with over 30 books and publications ranging from academic, theoretical texts to works of poetry and even children's books. Her writings are wide-ranging, covering topics from cultural representation and female friendship to masculinity and the important power of critical pedagogy.

hooks was born on September 25, 1952 and died December 15, 2021. She grew up in a rural, segregated community in the state of Kentucky, a state to where she eventually returned and became professor in residence at Berea College. The college founded the bell hooks Institute in 2014. She received a Bachelor's in English literature from Stanford University, then went on to earn a Master's and Doctorate from the University of Wisconsin and the University of California, Santa Cruz, respectively.

An important theme throughout hooks' work is the political power of community, sisterhood, and love as seen in works like *All About Love* (2000), *Feminism is for Everybody* (2000), and *Communism* (2002). hooks not only expressed this politics through her writing, but through her life and even her name. Her iconic moniker is an ode to her maternal grandmother and honors the legacies of Black women who came before her. She decided to use lowercase to highlight the content of her work rather than herself. This act of emphasizing community and message over individuality came to embody who hooks was as a feminist, writer, and activist.

hooks is well-known for introducing importance theoretical concepts such as the "oppositional gaze" (1992, 1993) and "white-supremacist capitalist patriarchy" (1984). The oppositional gaze references the power of looking for the marginalized subject, particularly Black women. Looking, hooks argues, is an act of resistance when done by Black folks. Tracing the control of Black people's ability to look, or rather, to not look, back to slavery, hooks says, "That all attempts to repress our/black peoples'

right to gaze had produced in us an overwhelming longing to look, a rebellious desire, an 'oppositional gaze'" (1992, 116). hooks applies the frame of the oppositional gaze to media and cinematic representations of Black women and argues the Black oppositional gaze is a tool that can be used to combat white supremacy. The white-supremacist capitalist patriarchy illuminates the interlocking and intersecting structures of oppression, known commonly today as intersectionality.

Ain't I a Woman: Black Women and Feminism (1981) and *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center* (1984) are two of hooks' most well-known books on feminist theory. They examine the devaluation of Black women and the intersections of race, gender, and class. In *From Margin to Center*, hooks specifically critiques the feminist movement for its inattention to issues of race and class, arguing the movement centered the needs of the least oppressed within the movement, those of white, middle-class women, and ignored women who existed on the margins. It is from this place of marginality, hooks argues, that a transformative feminist politics emerges because it takes into account other forms of oppression beyond just sexism. Similarly, *Ain't I a Woman*, which draws its title from the well-known Sojourner Truth speech, examines how Black women have been and still are devalued socially and politically because of their particular subject position as both Black and women, which means they experience sexism and racism in ways that cannot be disentangled.

Another one of hooks' most influential contributions is her work on engaged pedagogy and community. In *Teaching to Transgress* (1994), hooks recounts her own experience of teaching and learning, and focuses on the dichotomy of "education as the practice of freedom and education that merely strives to reinforce domination" (4). In her early childhood, hooks attended a segregated school, and it was in this environment where hooks felt the transformational power of education. Her teachers, who were Black women, were engaged with their students and committed to a practice of teaching that was political and counterhegemonic. As she says, "For black folks teaching – educating – was fundamentally political because it was rooted in antiracist struggle" (1994, 2). However, post-integration, her experience of education changed. Learning was no longer about anti-

racist struggle, but rather about learning and gaining knowledge for the sake of learning information. The space of the school was still political because of the presence of racism and sexism, but “the politics were no longer counter-hegemonic” (1994, 4). Thus, hooks presents *Teaching to Transgress* as a guide to both teachers and students as a call to reinvigorate the space of the classroom and reignite its transformative, transgressive potential.

hooks has left a lasting and powerful legacy within Black feminist thought. Although hooks may not be present on standard political science syllabi, her work is crucial for any student of political science who wants to engage in a critical analysis of power and is concerned with building a transformational feminist politics.

OLIVIA ATKINSON

References

- hooks, bell. 1981. *Ain't I a Woman: Black Women and Feminism*. Boston: South End Press.
- hooks, bell. 1984. *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*. London: Pluto Press.
- hooks, bell. 1992. *Black Looks: Race and Representation*. Boston: South End Press.
- hooks, bell. 1993. *The Oppositional Gaze: Black Female Spectators*. Boston: South End Press.
- hooks, bell. 1994. *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- hooks, bell. 2000. *All About Love: New Visions*. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.
- hooks, bell. 2000. *Feminism is for Everybody: Passionate Politics*. New York: Routledge.
- hooks, bell. 2002. *Communion: The Female Search for Love*. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.

See also

Intersectionality; Gender; Critical Pedagogy; Feminist Critiques; Critical Race Theory

182. Jacoby, Russell

Russell Jacoby (b. April 23, 1945) is a Professor Emeritus of History at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA). Jacoby was born in New York City and educated at the University of Chicago, the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and the University of Rochester, where he earned a Ph.D. (1974). Jacoby studied with Christopher Lasch, a renowned historian and cultural critic.

Jacoby's early work, including essays published in the recently founded journal *Telos*, as well as his first three books, were deeply indebted to modern European social theory, especially the Hegelian Marxism of Georg Lukács (1971) and the Frankfurt School (Arato and Piccone 1978). Jacoby used their ideas to criticize what he saw as the tradition of "orthodox" or positivistic Marxism, as well as conformist and ahistorical thinking in contemporary psychology and other fields. In the 1980s, Jacoby turned his attention to topics in American intellectual and cultural life, including higher education. His books are short, pungent, free of academic jargon, and based on an extensive reading of sources in several languages.

Jacoby's first book, *Social Amnesia*, targeted an array of modern psychological theories and clinical therapies that sought to position themselves as "beyond" Freud by describing the founder of psychoanalysis as a relic of nineteenth-century Vienna. For Jacoby (1975, 5), these neo- and post-Freudians were afflicted with social amnesia, which he described as "society's repression of remembrance – society's own past." Jacoby argued that Freud's depth psychology carried a sharper critical edge than supposedly radical psychiatric theories like those articulated by the existential psychiatrist R. D. Laing (1960, 1971).

Jacoby's next two books similarly combined ideology critique with the psychoanalytic recovery of buried intellectual and political traditions. In *Dialectic of Defeat* (1981), Jacoby recounted the fate of non-conformist Western Marxian thought that broke with a scientistic Marxism that had some grounding in the works of Karl Marx and had been carried forward in different ways by Friedrich Engels (2010a, 2010b) and V.I. Lenin (1967). This strain of

scientistic Marxism was exemplified at the time in the writings of the French philosopher Louis Althusser (1969, 1970). Jacoby's counter-current, attentive to consciousness, subjectivity, and culture, was represented by Rosa Luxemburg, Karl Korsch (1970), Georg Lukács, the Frankfurt School, and lesser-known figures (Jacoby 1981). In *The Repression of Psychoanalysis* (1983), Jacoby told the story of political Freudians, such as the Viennese psychoanalyst and socialist Otto Fenichel (1934, 1941), who combined a deep grounding in psychoanalysis with political and cultural dissent in the era of fascism. As emigres, the political Freudians represented a heritage of opposition to the growing insularity, medicalization, and stasis in conventional psychoanalysis, especially in the United States (Jacoby 1983).

Jacoby came to broader public attention with his 1987 book *The Last Intellectuals*, which is probably his best known and most cited work. This book highlighted important differences between mid-century American intellectuals, represented by figures such as Richard Hofstadter, C. Wright Mills, and Daniel Bell, who wrote for a broader, educated public, with a younger cohort of intellectuals in the 1980s, including academic radicals, who were increasingly insular and specialized in their writing and confined to intra-mural academic disputes. Jacoby (1986, 236) concluded that "while professional and arcane languages can be a refuge, and a necessity, they can also be an excuse and a flight." Jacoby's *Last Intellectuals* touched a nerve on the academic left and, consequently, his book elicited a great deal of comment and criticism, but it also brought the term "public intellectual" into widespread use.

Jacoby's next book *Dogmatic Wisdom* (1994) further developed his mordant analysis of American intellectual life. Jacoby's book landed amidst the new "culture wars" in higher education, which he thought were pointless, near-sighted, and largely oblivious to the grim social realities that existed off-campus. In a typical formulation, Jacoby (1994, xii) wrote that "conservatives, liberals and radicals argue over which books should be taught in schools; meanwhile few books are read, and a liberal education shatters under the weight of commercialism."

Jacoby's next two books took on the anti-utopian consensus of the post-Cold War era and the burial of the idea "that history

contains possibilities of freedom and pleasures hardly tapped” (Jacoby 1999, xii). In *The End of Utopia* (1999), Jacoby sheds light on his topic through a wide range of examples, both historical and contemporary, and he is unsparing in his criticism of the retreat into banality and pessimism of the academic mandarins. Jacoby (1999, 181) insisted that “in an era of political resignation and fatigue the utopian spirit remains more necessary than ever.” In *Picture Imperfect* (2005), Jacoby subjects an even broader slate of anti-utopian ideas to critical analysis, with arresting studies of such liberal skeptics as Karl Popper (1950), Hannah Arendt (1951), and Isaiah Berlin, whose anti-totalitarianism was accompanied by anti-utopianism. Jacoby wanted to preserve the spirit, but not the letter of utopianism. Jacoby (2005, xiv–xv) contrasted the “blueprint” utopians, who wanted to map out the future in inches and minutes from the “iconoclastic” utopians, who draw on parts of the Jewish tradition and who “dreamt of a superior society but who declined to give its precise measurements.”

Jacoby’s next book *Bloodlust* (2011), was subtitled “on the roots of violence from Cain and Abel to the present.” Drawing on Freud’s ideas of the “narcissism of small differences” and the dread of women, Jacoby argues that violence stems less from fear of strangers or the “other” than from intra-familial and community conflicts. *On Diversity* (2020) takes on the pious discourse that surrounds an important subject, arguing for forms of diversity rooted more in individuality than group difference. *Intellectuals in Politics and Academia* (2022) brings together essays from over four decades, including assessments and appreciations of a number of well-known writers and thinkers, and may serve as useful starting point for those new to Jacoby’s work.

JOSEPH G. PESCHEK

References

- Althusser, Louis. 1969. *For Marx*, translated by Ben Brewster. London: Allen Lane.
- Althusser, Louis and Etienne Balibar. 1970. *Reading Capital*, translated by Ben Brewster. London: New Left Books.
- Arato, Andrew and Paul Piccone, eds. 1978. *Essential Frankfurt School Reader*. New York: Urizen Books.
- Arendt, Hannah. 1951. *Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
- Engels, Frederick. 2010a. “Anti-Duhring: Herr Eugen Duhring’s Revolution in Science.” In *Marx-Engels Collected Works*, Volume 25, 5–312. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Engels, Frederick. 2010b. “The Dialectics of Nature.” In *Marx-Engels Collected Works*, Volume 25, 313–464. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Fenichel, Otto. 1934. *Outline of Clinical Psychoanalysis*, translated by Bertram D. Lewin and Gregory Zilboorg. New York: The Psychoanalytic Quarterly Press and W.W. Norton & Co., Inc.
- Fenichel, Otto. 1941. *Problems of Psychoanalytic Technique*, translated by David Brunswick. New York: The Psychoanalytic Quarterly.
- Jacoby, Russell. 1975. *Social Amnesia: A Critique of Contemporary Psychology*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Jacoby, Russell. 1981. *Dialectic of Defeat: Contours of Western Marxism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jacoby, Russell. 1983. *The Repression of Psychoanalysis: Otto Fenichel and the Political Freudians*. New York: Basic Books.
- Jacoby, Russell. 1987. *The Last Intellectuals: American Culture in the Age of Academe*. New York: Basic Books.
- Jacoby, Russell. 1994. *Dogmatic Wisdom: How the Culture Wars Divert Education and Distract America*. New York: Doubleday.
- Jacoby, Russell. 1999. *The End of Utopia: Politics and Culture in the Age of Apathy*. New York: Basic Books.
- Jacoby, Russell. 2005. *Picture Imperfect: Utopian Thought for an Anti-Utopian Age*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Jacoby, Russell. 2011. *Bloodlust: On the Roots of Violence from Cain and Abel to the Present*. New York: Free Press.
- Jacoby, Russell. 2020. *On Diversity: The Eclipse of the Individual in a Global Era*. New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Jacoby, Russell. 2022. *Intellectuals in Politics and Academia: Culture in the Age of Hype*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Korsch, Karl. 1970. *Marxism and Philosophy*, translated from the German, with an introduction by Fred Halliday. London: New Left Books.
- Laing, R. D. 1960. *Divided Self: A Study of Sanity and Madness*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Laing, R. D. 1971. *Politics of the Family and Other Essays*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Lenin, Vladimir Ilich. 1967. *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

- Lukács, Georg. 1971. *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.
- Popper, Karl. 1950. *Open Society and Its Enemies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

See also

Critical Theory; Critical University Studies; Intellectuals; Herbert Marcuse; Reification

183. Jameson, Fredric

Fredric Jameson (born April 14, 1934–) is a neo-Marxist literary critic and political philosopher. His main topics of analysis belong to the fields of the study of literary criticism, cultural studies and critical philosophy. He was one of the first Americans who introduced postwar continental philosophy in his country, in an age when empiricism and logical positivism were intellectually hegemonic over the humanities and social sciences faculties. He wrote more than thirty books covering a myriad of subject matters, ranging from architecture, modern literature, cinema, political epistemology, and the concept of ideology. His most important works set the debates about the overall meaning of postmodernism and the conceptualization of the political unconscious, thereby focusing on the transitions from modern to postmodern times in terms of changing ideological constellations and the production of subjectivities. As a Marxist he continues to adhere to a materialist theory of ideology, therefore describing postmodernism as the cultural logic of the late capitalist stage of production. His unique form of theoretical eclecticism can be explained by a multitude of intellectual influences: existentialism, German philosophy, neo-Hegelian Marxism, structuralism and neo-Freudian psychoanalysis.

Jameson spent most of his youthful years in liberal middle-class New Jersey and he received his education in a Quaker school espousing critical thinking and civic duty. He studied French and German at Haverford College in the early 1950s, and obtained his Master's degree in Arts at Yale University. In between he was briefly enrolled at universities in Southern France, Munich and Berlin. His first direct experience with European intellectual life allowed him to immerse in the ubiquitous presence of Sartrean existentialism. Furthermore, he was interested in the emergence of structuralist thought, which, at that time, was linked to the psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan and the anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss. He also became acquainted with the writings of leading neo-Hegelian philosophers such as Alexandre Kojève and Jean Hyppolite, who would subsequently influence the French post-war generations. He was also struck by 'Nietzschean-Hegelian' Georges Bataille

and early structuralist Roland Barthes, who infused the long-established institute of art criticism with an overall ideological interrogation of society and its concurrent forms of subjectivity. In Germany he studied the Hegelian ideas of György Lukács and Theodor Adorno (Helmling 2001, 168). Erich Auerbach, one of the founders of comparative literature, and Henri Peyre are considered to have had a definitive intellectual influence on the young Jameson, pushing him towards an interdisciplinary approach when analysing literary texts. Auerbach emphasized that, contrary to the prevalent ideas of New Criticism, literary forms should be analysed within their historical and social contexts. Decades later, Jameson would exclaim: "Always historicize ... [it is] the imperative of all dialectical thought" (Jameson 2002a, ix).

In the 1960s, the New Left emerged within academic circles. Thenceforth Jameson began an intensive study of Marx's oeuvre. In the 1970s, he penned his first works, writing a critique of French structuralism and his first attempt to reconstruct a dialectical methodology for the purpose of developing a Hegelian-Marxist type of literary criticism. In 1981, he published his first seminal and extensively cited work, *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. At the outset this book is characterized by his deep wish to link the kernel of Marxist political theory, historical materialism and class struggle, to the conceptual devices of neo-Freudian psychoanalysis, particularly the unconscious as a depository of anonymous social forces producing political subjectivities. From the perspective of cultural criticism, Jameson insists we should conceptualize all inherited artifacts as, "socially symbolic acts ... discovering [their] class character and ideological functionality" (Jameson 2002a, 5, 276). For Jameson, historical materialism makes us aware of the fact that we need to develop an adequate epistemology in structural terms in order to understand a social ontology in its totality. The economic logic of capital is hereby always present in ideological imaginaries of society and vice versa. We produce and share a collective ideological unconscious, and a historical materialist theory of ideology allows us to understand how our subjectivity historically came into being. Ideology is the mediating concept between the subject and the social or between

conscious acting and the syntax of the unconscious. At the same time, ideology buries and represses the antagonistic nature of reality, representing the social ontology of this reality as an imaginary one-dimensional landscape. Ideology signals, as Jameson would put it later, a rift between the realities and its own cultural representations in which “the sense people have of themselves and their own moment of history may ultimately have nothing whatsoever to do with its reality” (Jameson 1991, 281).

Jameson would further elaborate his theory of the political unconscious throughout the 1980s, which would eventually result in another groundbreaking work: *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (1991). Overall, this book maps the cultural modes of realism, modernism and postmodernism paralleling the three phases of capitalism. But foremost it shows in detail the relationship between the economic forms of capitalism and the cultural logics it houses. Contemporary late capitalism, defined by a globalized and enlarged spread of monopoly capital and consumerist subjectivity, and postmodernism are two sides of the same dialectical coin. He describes the postmodern logic both in terms of a general social logic, a type of subjectivity and a specific mode of ideological epistemology: “the perpetual present and its multiple historical amnesias ... the waning of our sense of history and ... [losing] totalizing concepts like that of the mode of production” (Jameson, 1991, 170,

405). In the last few decades, Jameson would precisely write many other works with the intent to salvage our sense of history and to rescue a critical epistemology, acting against the “social and intellectual regressions as a consequence of postmodernity” (Jameson, 2002b: 3).

JELLE VERSIEREN

References

- Helmling, Steven. 2001. *The Success and Failure of Fredric Jameson: Writing, the Sublime, and the Dialectic of Critique*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Jameson, Fredric. 1991. *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Jameson, Fredric. 2002a. *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. London: Routledge.
- Jameson, Fredric. 2002b. *A Singular Modernity. Essay on the Ontology of the Present*. London: Verso.

Further readings

- Jameson, Fredric. 2008. *The Ideologies of Theory*. London: Verso.
- Jameson, Fredric. 2009. *Valences of the Dialectic*. London: Verso.

See also

- Literary Criticism; Postmodernism; Ideology Critique

184. Jessop, Bob

Bob Jessop (b. March 3, 1946–) is Professor Emeritus of Sociology at the University of Lancaster, with which he has been affiliated since 1990. Jessop received an undergraduate degree in sociology from the University of Exeter. He earned his Ph.D. in Sociology at the University of Cambridge in 1972. Jessop spent five years (1970–75) as a Research Fellow in Social and Political Sciences at Cambridge, where he first became interested in state theory. He subsequently joined the University of Essex's Department of Government (1975–90), settling thereafter in Lancaster.

Jessop has made influential and wide-ranging contributions to political sociology, historical sociology, political economy, and social and political theory. He is particularly well-known for his pioneering work on Marxist state theory, but he has also written extensively on a range of other topics, from regulation theory to Fordist regimes of capital accumulation. He is the author of over twenty books and the editor of more than twenty volumes. He has published over 200 book chapters and over 100 peer-reviewed journal articles. He sits on the editorial advisory boards of nearly twenty peer-reviewed journals. Much of his work has been translated into Chinese, Danish, German, Greek, Japanese, Korean, Russian, Spanish, and Turkish.

For over half a century, since he first began publishing at the end of the 1960s, Jessop's work has been distinguished by a remarkable combination of analytical precision and theoretical multifacetedness. The first wave of research, finding expression in a steady stream of books, book chapters, and journal articles during the 1970s and early 1980s, focused on topics in political sociology and Marxist state theory. Jessop's specific interests in this period included Antonio Gramsci, Nicos Poulantzas, and European traditions of critiquing the capitalist state more generally (1982, 1983). They also included the political economy of post-World War II Britain (1971, 1974) and questions of legal and political theory (1980a, 1980b). Much of this work was informed by Jessop's involvement in the Conference of Socialist Economists, particularly recurrent interaction with Werner Bonefeld, Simon Clarke, John Holloway, and

others engaged in debates about the value form that would eventually engender the "Open Marxism" school.

By the mid- to late 1980s, the conceptual sophistication Jessop brought to bear on his broad range of interests had come to lay the groundwork for a new "strategic-relational approach" to state theory, and questions of agency and structure in the social sciences more broadly. Jessop set out this approach in *State Theory: Putting the Capitalist State in Its Place* (1990), a collection of essays that showcased his work on Marxist theories of law and the state, their "relative autonomy" from the economic sphere, the formation of hegemony and the operation of ideology, and different modes of political representation for different states and social formations. Crucially, this book was preceded by a study of Poulantzas (1985), whose views on class, the capital-relation, and the forms and functions of capitalist states Jessop had sought to develop since the early 1970s, as well as a co-authored book on the neoliberal offensive inaugurated by Margaret Thatcher's Conservative government (Jessop, Bonnett, Bromley, and Ling 1988). This period was also marked by Jessop's growing interest in critical discourse analysis, particularly the work of Michel Foucault (1987, 1990), as well as in theories of regulation (1988).

During the 1990s, Jessop deepened and amplified his existing interests, continuing to write on neoliberalism, the transition from Fordism to post-Fordism, and the political economy of the United Kingdom. As with many Marxist social scientists of his generation, Jessop worked on theories of governance (1997), the post-Cold War internationalization of capital (1994), and economic and institutional changes in the "post-socialist" states of eastern Europe and beyond (Hausner, Jessop, and Nielsen 1995). Distinctively, he also wrote extensively on Joseph Schumpeter and the idea of a "workfare state" (1995).

From the turn of the millennium to the present day, Jessop has continued to write prolifically. Notably, Jessop has provided three systematic, book-length explanations of his "strategic-relational approach" to state theory (2002, 2007, 2016a). This approach has laid the theoretical and methodological foundations for a new perspective on political economy, particularly issues of finance, regulation, and the so-called "knowledge

economy,” which he and Ngai-Ling Sum (2006, 2013) have termed “cultural political economy.” It has also resulted in an extension of Jessop’s interest in governance theory (2016b, 2020). Jessop has combined his writing with service to students and the broader scholarly community by editing several large, multi-volume compendia of writings on Marx’s social and political thought (Jessop and Malcolm-Brown 1990; Jessop and Wheatley 1999), regulation theory (Jessop 2001), and state power and territoriality under capitalism (Brenner, Jessop, Jones, and Macleod 2003). His work since 2000 testifies to the ongoing importance of theories of the state and variegated capitalism.

UMUT ÖZSU

References

- Brenner, Neil, Bob Jessop, Martin Jones, and Gordon Macleod, eds. 2003. *State/Space: A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hausner, Jerzy, Bob Jessop, and Klaus Nielsen, eds. 1995. *Strategic Choice and Path-Dependency in Post-Socialism: Institutional Dynamics in the Transformation Process*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Jessop, Bob. 1971. “Civility and Traditionalism in British Political Culture.” *British Journal of Political Science* 1, no. 1: 1–24.
- Jessop, Bob. 1974. *Traditionalism, Conservatism and British Political Culture*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Jessop, Bob. 1980a. “On Recent Marxist Theories of Law, the State, and Juridico-Political Ideology.” *International Journal of the Sociology of Law* 8, no. 4: 339–68.
- Jessop, Bob. 1980b. “The Political Indeterminacy of Democracy.” In *Marxism and Democracy*, edited by Alan Hunt, 55–80. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Jessop, Bob. 1982. *The Capitalist State: Marxist Theories and Methods*. Oxford: Martin Robertson.
- Jessop, Bob. 1983. “Accumulation Strategies, State Forms, and Hegemonic Projects.” *Kapitalistate* no. 10/11: 89–111.
- Jessop, Bob. 1985. *Nicos Poulantzas: Marxist Theory and Political Strategy*. London: Macmillan.
- Jessop, Bob. 1987. “Power and Strategy in Foucault and Poulantzas.” *Ideas and Production* 6, no. 1: 59–84.
- Jessop, Bob, Kevin Bonnett, Simon Bromley, and Tom Ling. 1988. *Thatcherism: A Tale of Two Nations*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Jessop, Bob. 1988. “Regulation Theory, Post Fordism and the State: More Than a Reply to Werner Bonefeld.” *Capital & Class* 12, no. 1: 147–68.
- Jessop, Bob. 1990. *State Theory: Putting the Capitalist State in Its Place*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Jessop, Bob, and Charlie Malcolm-Brown, eds. 1990. *Karl Marx’s Social and Political Thought: Critical Assessments*. Volumes I–IV. London: Routledge.
- Jessop, Bob. 1994. “Changing Forms and Functions of the State in an Era of Globalization and Regionalization.” In *The Political Economy of Diversity: Evolutionary Perspectives on Economic Order and Disorder*, edited by Robert Delorme and Kurt Dopfer, 102–25. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Jessop, Bob. 1995. “Towards a Schumpeterian Workfare Regime in Britain? Reflections on Regulation, Governance, and Welfare State.” *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 27, no. 10: 1613–26.
- Jessop, Bob. 1997. “Capitalism and Its Future: Remarks on Regulation, Government and Governance.” *Review of International Political Economy* 4, no. 3: 561–81.
- Jessop, Bob, and Russell Wheatley, eds. 1999. *Karl Marx’s Social and Political Thought: Critical Assessments*. Volumes V–VIII. London: Routledge.
- Jessop, Bob, ed. 2001. *Regulation Theory and the Crisis of Capitalism*, 5 volumes. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Jessop, Bob. 2002. *The Future of the Capitalist State*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Jessop, Bob, and Ngai-Ling Sum. 2006. *Beyond the Regulation Approach: Putting Capitalist Economies in Their Place*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Jessop, Bob. 2007. *State Power: A Strategic-Relational Approach*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Jessop, Bob. 2016a. *The State: Past, Present, Future*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Jessop, Bob. 2016b. “Territory, Politics, Governance and Multispatial Metagovernance.” *Territory, Politics, Governance* 4, no. 1: 8–32.
- Jessop, Bob. 2020. *Putting Civil Society in Its Place: Governance, Metagovernance and Subjectivity*. Bristol, UK: Policy Press.
- Sum, Ngai-Ling, and Bob Jessop. 2013. *Towards a Cultural Political Economy: Putting Culture in Its Place in Political Economy*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Further readings

Jessop, Bob, and Jamie Morgan. 2022. "The Strategic-Relational Approach, Realism and the State: From Regulation Theory to

Neoliberalism via Marx and Poulantzas, an Interview with Bob Jessop." *Journal of Critical Realism* 21, no. 1: 83–118.

See also

Marxism; Theories of the State I and II; Nicos Poulantzas

185. Katsiaficas, George

George Katsiaficas was born in El Paso, Texas in 1949 and grew up in the U.S. Army. In the U.S., Katsiaficas attended public schools in Brooklyn and Queens, New York, and finished high school at Baltimore Polytechnic Institute (a public inner-city school). However, by the time he left home to go to college at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (M.I.T.), he had lived more than half his life abroad in Germany and Taiwan.

Katsiaficas first became active in social movements in 1969 and, in 1970, in the midst of the nationwide student strike, he graduated from M.I.T. while in solitary confinement after being convicted for “Disturbing a School” while organizing anti-war protests. After his release from prison, he founded the Red Bookstore in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Katsiaficas escaped continual arrests and prosecution in Cambridge for his support of the Black Panther Party, and eventually moved to California, where he helped build a network of countercultural institutions in Ocean Beach, San Diego. He went on to lead an anti-police movement, founded another collectively managed non-profit bookstore, helped organize a food co-op, and led study groups based on the writings of James and Grace Lee Boggs. After driving a taxi for several years, he became friends with Herbert Marcuse and enrolled at the University of California, San Diego, where he earned his Ph.D. in 1983.

With Marcuse’s support, Katsiaficas received a Fulbright Fellowship and enrolled at the Free University of Berlin. In his doctoral thesis, he uncovered the “Eros Effect” to explain the global synchronicity of movements in 1968. His 1987 book, *The Imagination of the New Left: A Global Analysis of 1968* (1987) was the first study to comprehend a globally unified uprising among the plethora of diverse social movements involving millions of ordinary people that had emerged simultaneously, rejecting dominant values such as national chauvinism, hierarchy, and individualism. In 2007, at a conference at Queen’s University in Canada, Katsiaficas maintained that despite the relative quietude prevailing at the time, protests on a global scale were soon to erupt, a prediction verified by the subsequent Arab

Spring, Occupy Wall Street, and Black Lives Matter movements (Thompson 2017).

For years, Katsiaficas taught at Boston’s Wentworth Institute of Technology, a working-class college, during which time he was a research affiliate at Harvard University in both European and Korean studies. After his book on 1968 was translated into Korean and became something of a bestseller, he visited Gwangju for the first time in 1999. In 2007, he was awarded a Fulbright fellowship to Korea, and he lived and taught at Chonnam National University in Gwangju, South Korea for many years. His research and writings have consistently challenged Eurocentric and traditional approaches to social theory. Inspired by the 1980 Gwangju People’s Uprising, he devoted 13 years to completing his two-volume book, *Asia’s Unknown Uprisings* (2012), which places Gwangju at the center of a wave of Asian insurgencies that overthrew eight dictatorships in six years.

His second book, *The Subversion of Politics: European Autonomous Social Movements and the Decolonization of Everyday Life* (1997) analysed post-1968 radical formations in Germany, Switzerland, Italy, Holland, and Denmark. His writing about the German autonomous movement, with its emphasis on revolutionary politics, squatted housing and cultural spaces, and street militancy including black bloc tactics, was influential for many anarchists and other U.S.-based radicals at that time. Katsiaficas is a militant researcher, who lives amongst and collaborates with the people he writes about and sees his research as advancing global activism, not simply describing or analysing it. For instance, together with Kathleen Cleaver, he edited *Liberation, Imagination and the Black Panther Party* (2001). His latest book, *The Global Imagination of 1968: Revolution and Counterrevolution* (2019) discusses 1960s movements in more than 50 countries and outlines global waves of uprisings subsequent to 1968. During his international sojourns, he has been active in liberation struggles in Germany, Lebanon, Korea, Greece, and other places. His books have been translated into Korean, Russian, Greek, and Spanish.

Katsiaficas was editor of *New Political Science* (1998–2003), Chairperson of the Caucus for a New Political Science (1989–91), and founded a book series

for the Caucus. Under his leadership, the CNPS became an Organized Section of the American Political Science Association. His many honors include the Kim Dae-jung Scholar's Award at Chonnam National University; being made an Honorary Citizen of Gwangju; and the Charles A. McCoy Career Achievement Award presented by the New Political Science Section of the APSA in 2011. His website is ErosEffect.com.

VICTOR WALLIS

References

- Katsiaficas, George. 1987. *The Imagination of the New Left: A Global Analysis of 1968*. Boston: South End Press.
- Katsiaficas, George. 2006. *The Subversion of Politics: European Autonomous Social Movements and the Decolonization of Everyday Life*. Oakland, CA: AK Press, 2006.
- Katsiaficas, George. 2012. *Asia's Unknown Uprisings: Vol. 1 South Korean Social Movements In the Twentieth Century; Vol. 2 People Power in the Philippines, Burma, Tibet, China, Taiwan, Bangladesh, Nepal, Thailand and Indonesia, 1947–2009*. Oakland, CA: PM Press.
- Katsiaficas, George. 2019. *The Global Imagination of 1968: Revolution and Counterrevolution*. Oakland, CA: PM Press.
- Katsiaficas, George and Teodros Kiros, eds. 1998. *The Promise of Multiculturalism: Education and Autonomy in the 21st Century*. New York: Routledge.
- Katsiaficas, George and Rodolfo Torres, eds. 1999. *Latino Social Movements: Theoretical and Practical Perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Katsiaficas, George and Kathleen Cleaver, eds. 2001. *Liberation, Imagination and the Black Panther Party*. New York: Routledge.
- Thompson, A.K., ed. 2017. *Spontaneous Combustion: The Eros Effect and Global Revolution*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Katsiaficas, George and R. George Kirkpatrick. 1987. *Introduction to Critical Sociology*. New York: Irvington Publishers.
- Katsiaficas, George. 1992. *Vietnam Documents: American and Vietnamese Views of the War*. New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- Katsiaficas, George. 2001. *After the Fall: 1989 and the Future of Freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- Katsiaficas, George, Eddie Yuen, and Daniel Burton-Rose, eds. 2002. *The Battle of Seattle*. New York: Soft Skull Press.
- Katsiaficas, George, Eddie Yuen and Daniel Burton-Rose, eds. 2004. *Confronting Capitalism: Dispatches from a Global Movement*. New York: Soft Skull Press.
- Katsiaficas, George and Na Kahn-chae, eds. 2006. *South Korean Democracy: Legacy of the Gwangju Uprising*. London: Routledge.
- Katsiaficas, George. 2003. *Interviews with the Shimgun, 2 volumes of interviews with participants in the Gwangju Uprising published by May 18 Institute*. Gwangju: South Korea: Chonnam National University Press. [In Korean].

Further readings

See also

Social Movement Analysis; Herbert Marcuse

186. Kesselman, Mark

Mark Kesselman (1938–) is a prominent member of the generation of political scientists who attended college in the 1950s and whose lives and careers were fundamentally transformed by the upheavals of the 1960s. A founding member of the Caucus for a New Political Science, Kesselman is best known for his pathbreaking work on local politics in France, for his research and teaching on social democracy and welfare states in Western Europe, and for his textbooks on comparative politics, European politics, U.S. politics, and globalization. A graduate of Cornell University (B.A. 1959) and the University of Chicago (Ph.D. 1965), Kesselman taught at Columbia University from 1964 until his retirement in 2007.

Kesselman is the author, editor, and co-editor of nearly a dozen books, including *The Ambiguous Consensus: A Study of Local Government in France* (1967); *The French Workers' Movement, 1968–1982: Economic Crisis and Political Change* (1984); *The Politics of Power: A Critical Introduction to American Politics* (2014, 7th edition); and *Regards Croisés USA-France: Mouvements et politique en temps de crises* (2022).

In addition, Kesselman has contributed to numerous journals, including *Comparative Politics*, *French Politics and Society*, *Journal of Politics*, *Kapitalstate*, *Midwest Journal of Political Science*, *New Political Science*, *New Politics*, *Politics and Society*, *Social Research*, *Socialist Register*, *Telos*, *Travail*, and *World Politics*. He served as the co-editor of the *International Journal of Political Science* from 2009 to 2017, and he has published op-eds in the *New York Times*, the *Times of India*, *Al Jazeera.com*, *Indian Express*, *Témoignage Chrétien*, and elsewhere.

Kesselman has been a visiting professor at the Institut d'Etudes Politiques d'Aix-en-Provence, New York University, the University of Bordeaux, the University of Lille-II, the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, and the University of Paris-VIII. His research has received funding from the Fulbright Program, the Guggenheim Foundation, the National Institute of Education, the National Science Foundation, and the Rockefeller Foundation.

Kesselman's first book, *The Ambiguous Consensus* (1967), revitalized the study of local politics in France, while his *World Politics* article on "Order or Movement? The Literature of Political Development as Ideology" (1973) helped spark a debate across the discipline concerning the limitations of mainstream development theory. His subsequent contributions to peer review journals are mainly concerned with various aspects of organized labor, social movements, and leftist parties in France (e.g., Kesselman 1983, 11–41). But he has also written on the nexus of neo-Marxism and political science (e.g., Greenstone 1982; Ollman and Vernoff 1982). In collaboration with several co-authors and co-editors, most notably Ira Katznelson and Joel Krieger, Kesselman has written and edited several textbooks and readers aimed at undergraduates and graduate students.

Nicholas Toloudis (2008, 187–214) has written on Kesselman's contributions to comparative politics, and the study of the French left (Toloudis 2007, 160–77), while *New Political Science* published a career-spanning interview with Kesselman in 2008 (Worcester 2008, 67–87). In 2017, Kesselman received the Charles A. McCoy Career Achievement Award from the Caucus for a New Political Science.

KENTON WORCESTER

References

- Kesselman, Mark. 1967. *The Ambiguous Consensus: A Study of Local Government in France*. New York: Knopf.
- Kesselman, Mark. 1982. "The Conflictual Evolution of American Political Science: From Apologetic Pluralism to Trilateralism and Marxism." In *Public Values and Private Power in American Democracy*, edited by J. David Greenstone, 34–67. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kesselman, Mark. 1973. "Order or Movement? The Literature of Political Development as Ideology." *World Politics* 26, no. 1 (October): 139–54.
- Kesselman, Mark. 1983. "Socialism without the Workers: The Case of France." *Kapitalstate* 10/11: 11–41.
- Kesselman, Mark. 1982. "The State and Class Struggle: Trends in Marxist Political Science." In *The Left Academy: Marxist Scholarship on American Campuses*, edited by Bertell Ollman and Edward Vernoff, 82–114. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Toloudis, Nicholas. 2008. "Mark Kesselman and the Study of Comparative Politics." *New Political Science* 30, no. 2 (June): 187–214.
 - Toloudis, Nicholas. 2007. "Mark Kesselman and the Study of the French Left." *French Politics* 5: 160–77.
 - Worcester, Kent. 2008. "Rethinking Political Science: An Interview with Mark Kesselman." *New Political Science* 30, no. 1 (March): 67–87.
- Further readings**
- Chapman, Herrick, Mark Kesselman, and Martin A. Schain, eds. 1998. *A Century of Organized Labor in France: A Union Movement for the Twenty-First Century?* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
 - Cirera, Daniel, Guy Groux, and Mark Kesselman. 2022. *Regards Croisés USA-France: Mouvements et politique en temps de crises.* Paris: Arbre Bleu.
 - Groux, Guy and Mark Kesselman, eds. 1984. *The French Workers' Movement, 1968–1982: Economic Crisis and Political Change.* London: Allen & Unwin.
 - Katznelson, Ira, Mark Kesselman, and Alan Draper. 2013. *The Politics of Power: A Critical Introduction to American Government*, 7th edn. New York: W.W. Norton and Co., Inc.
 - Kesselman, Mark. 1992. "How Should One Study Economic Policymaking? Four Characters in Search of an Object." *World Politics* 44, 4 (July): 645–72.
 - Kesselman, Mark, ed. 2006. *Politics of Globalization: A Reader.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
 - Kesselman, Mark ed. 2009. *Readings in Comparative Politics.* 2nd edn. Boston: Cengage.
 - Kesselman, Mark and Joel Krieger. 2019. *European Politics in Transition.* 6th edn. Boston: Cengage.
 - Kesselman, Mark, Joel Krieger, and William A. Joseph. 2017. *Introduction to Comparative Politics: Political Challenges and Changing Agendas.* 8th edn. Boston: Cengage.
 - Krieger, Joel, William Joseph, and Mark Kesselman, eds. 1997. *Communist and Post-Communist Politics at the Crossroads.* Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

187. Kolko, Gabriel

Gabriel Kolko (August 17, 1932–May 19, 2014) was a political historian of American capitalism. Born in Paterson, New Jersey to Jewish parents, Kolko received a B.A. in History from Kent State University (1954), an M.A. in social history from the University of Wisconsin (1955), and a Ph.D. from Harvard University in 1962. Kolko was a proud socialist and a key figure in the emerging New Left of the 1960s. As a graduate student, Kolko became a leading voice within the Student League for Industrial Democracy (SLID), an organization that would later become the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). Throughout his years as a student, Kolko wrote works such as *Wealth and Power in America* (1962), which examined the distribution of wealth and income in an era when the topic of economic inequality was mostly ignored by social scientists and historians.

In his doctoral dissertation, which was later published as *Railroads and Regulations* (1965), Kolko challenged the hegemonic liberal narrative that the main purpose of the American regulatory state was to inhibit and constrain the interests of big business and economic elites. He did so by carefully documenting a surprising discovery within the archives: the Americans who pushed most for federal regulation of the railroads in the Progressive Era were the railroad capitalists themselves, who were seeking to legitimize their monopolistic power, skirt far more aggressive regulations on the state level, and stabilize corporate capitalism that had been suffering from “ruinous competition” during the Gilded Age. “The dominant fact of American political life of this century,” Kolko (1963, 57–8) would later summarize, “was that big business led the struggle for federal regulation of the economy.”

Kolko would elaborate on this argument in his classic *The Triumph of Conservatism* (1963, 2), which liberals viewed as a work of heresy more than history. “I contend that the period from approximately 1900 until the United States’ intervention in the war, labeled the ‘Progressive Era’ by virtually all historians,” Kolko declared in the introduction to the book, “was really an era of conservatism.” Conservative, Kolko went on to explain, because it was “an effort to pre-

serve the basic social and economic relations essential to a capitalist society.”

Along with William Appleman Williams, Martin Sklar, and James Weinstein, Kolko became one of the founding fathers of the “corporate liberal” school which stressed that the modern liberal state aided and abetted corporate capitalism far more than it inhibited it. Corporate liberalism has remained one of the most important interventions in American historiography in part because it succeeded in denaturalizing capitalist relations, rejecting “laissez-faire” theories of development, and stressing the crucial role that the state and its regulatory system played in the very making of modern corporate capitalism.

After deeming the Progressive Era conservative, Kolko – along with his wife Joyce – turned his critical eye to American foreign policy, the Cold War, and Vietnam. Here too, Kolko sought to challenge the conventional wisdom of the field by examining the heretofore neglected relationship between foreign policy and corporate capitalism. In *The Politics of War* (1968), he linked domestic and foreign policy by arguing that one of the main goals of American warfare was to suppress the Left at home and preserve corporate capitalist social relations. In *The Limits of Power* (1972), he contended that it was American capitalism’s unquenched need for overseas markets as an outlet for corporate surplus production that forced the United States to take the offensive following World War II.

Kolko’s writings and his politics remained firmly enmeshed: as a crucial voice of the New Left, he became one of the most outspoken critics of American war crimes, supported the North Vietnamese cause, and was actually in Vietnam when Saigon fell (or, as Kolko would have it, liberated). Kolko even left his position at the University of Pennsylvania after discovering that the school had participated in research on the infamous chemical weapon known as “Agent Orange.” In 1970, he moved to Canada, where he taught at York University for the remainder of his career.

ELI COOK

References

- Kolko, Gabriel. 1962. *Wealth and Power in America: An Analysis of Social Class and Income Distribution*. New York: Praeger.

Kolko, Gabriel. 1965. *Railroads and Regulations: 1877–1917*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kolko, Gabriel. 1963. *The Triumph of Conservatism: A Reinterpretation of American History, 1900–1916*. New York: The Free Press.

Kolko, Gabriel and Joyce Kolko. 1972. *The Limits of Power: The World and United States Foreign Policy, 1945–1954*. New York: Harper and Row.

Kolko, Gabriel. 1968. *The Politics of War. The World and the United States Foreign Policy, 1943–1945*. New York: Random House.

See also

Corporate Liberalism; William Appleman Williams

188. Laclau, Ernesto

Ernesto Laclau (Buenos Aires, October 6, 1935–Seville, April 13, 2014) was an Argentinian post-Marxist political theorist and political analyst. Laclau studied History at the University of Buenos Aires (1954–64) under the 1955 military regime, where he assisted sociologist Gino Germani and was engaged in student and socialist movements. During this time, he joined the Socialist Party of the National Left (PSIN), directed the newspaper *Lucha Obrera* (lit. Workers' Struggle) and wrote for *Izquierda Nacional* (lit. National Left) (Acha 2013, 58–61).

Laclau's most notable work was conducted during his tenure at the University of Essex, where he obtained his Ph.D. in 1977, supervised by Eric Hobsbawm on the topic of local capitalism in the nineteenth century (Acha 2013, 62). From 1986, he served there as Professor of Political Theory and directed a postgraduate program in Ideology and Discourse Analysis. With his lifelong partner and co-author, Chantal Mouffe, he led what became known as the Essex School of discourse analysis (Townshend 2003).

Laclau's academic production has been inscribed within post-Marxism and poststructuralism due to his articulation of traditional Marxist thought with Lacanian psychoanalysis, and linguistic and discursive approaches (Glynos and Stavrakakis 2010; Townsend 2003). His seminal work with Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy* (1985, 1–2, 53ff), sought to deconstruct class identities, focusing instead on possible articulations among new social movements. Laclau and Mouffe (1985, 7ff) criticize class as an analytical category, and advocate instead for the notion of *hegemony*, tracing the concept back to thinkers like Rosa Luxemburg, Leon Trotsky, V.I. Lenin, and Antonio Gramsci. While these claims have resulted in criticism from Marxist theorists (e.g., Geras 1987; Veltmeyer 2000), Laclau has argued that the “post” in their post-Marxist approach does not imply leaving behind Marxist categories, but exploring their blind spots and tensions and attempting to resolve them with intellectual tools from the leftist repertoire (Howarth 2014, 258). Hegemony, they argue, captures the emergence of dominant political arrangements as well as their moments of fissure and the possibilities of change (Hansen and

Sonnichsen 2014, 255) by examining how social movements articulate their specific and contingent demands (Laclau and Mouffe 1985, 105ff). Any struggle for hegemony implies the dislocation of meaning that destabilizes existing identifications and discourses to trigger new configurations of meaning.

In later works, including *New Reflections* (1990) and *Emancipation(s)* (1996), Laclau continued to develop the concept of hegemony, drawing on theoretical contributions from linguistics, psychoanalysis, and rhetoric studies, in search of “a more formal general ontology” of the social (Howarth 2014, 261). Expanding on the notion that social norms and behavior are not necessary but contingent, that they emerge from struggles over hegemony instead of hegemonic struggles as the result of singular historical processes of institution, and are therefore potentially different (Marchart 2014, 275). Laclau (1990, 34) further explains that “rejected alternatives do not mean everything that is logically possible, but those alternatives which were in fact attempted, which thus represented antagonistic alternatives.” He argues that the social is constituted by layers of meaning sedimented at concrete historical moments of exclusion and antagonism.

Moreover, Laclau (1996, 14–15, 38–9) has called attention to the role of negativity in creating identities and the antagonistic conflict that determines the outside against which struggles are formed (Marchart 2014, 277). The identities behind those antagonistic struggles are also contingent, themselves emerging from “some kind of exclusion or deprivation” (Laclau 2005, 125). The potential articulation to counter that exclusion thus rests on the possibility of creating *chains of equivalence* with other groups and their demands (Laclau 2005, 77, 125; Howarth 2014, 160–64). To do so, those demands need to become *nodal points*, partial, temporary fixations of meaning in signifiers that bring together collective identities, points of identification, and agreement for otherwise disparate groups (Laclau and Mouffe 1985, 112). He introduced the notion of the *empty signifier* to signal symbolic forms that are particularly apt to become a nodal point in a chain of equivalence (Laclau 1996, 36ff) and that can range from traditional political symbols, such as a flag, to individual persons, such as a political leader. Democracy, for instance, is an empty signifier par excellence,

an open-ended idea that can never be fully defined and is open to ongoing contestation (Laclau 1996, 73).

In exploring how political articulation allows linking numerous demands into broader, overarching political projects, Laclau has been especially interested in populist movements because they constitute a typical case of hegemony-building. In particular, he has been inspired by decades-long dialogues with Argentinean Peronism and other experiences of Latin American populism, which orthodox Marxism had failed to comprehend and explain (Laclau 2005, 215–20). In his view, populist politics always involves the articulation of equivalences between different identities and movements against an enemy, an antagonist, thus creating an ideal empty signifier to unify the differences, such as “social justice” (Laclau 2005, 191–200). He emphasizes a psychoanalytical approach that considers the affective dimensions of populist discourse to explain its socio-political embedding: each side of the antagonistic cleavage is represented by an identity such as “the people” and “the establishment,” “the system” and the “underdogs,” mobilizing identification and “jouissance” (Glynos and Stavrakakis 2010). Yet, this antagonism is not incompatible with democracy, but can even foster pluralism, because it creates the possibility to join heterogeneous demands under a “common cause” (Laclau 2005, 74, 125–8). Consequently, the discursive constitution of a “people” is a radical political act insofar as it “constitutes social agents as such and does not express a previously given unity of the group” (Laclau 2005, 118).

MELISA ROSS

References

- Acha, Omar. 2013. “Del Populismo Marxista al Postmarxista: la Trayectoria de Ernesto Laclau en la Izquierda Nacional (1963–2013).” *Archivos de historia del movimiento obrero y la izquierda* 3: 57–78.
- Geras, Norman. 1987. “‘Post-Marxism’?” *New Left Review* 163: 40–82.
- Glynos, Jason, and Yannis Stavrakakis. 2010. “Politics and the unconscious – An interview with Ernesto Laclau.” *Subjectivity* 3, no. 3: 231–44.
- Hansen, Allan Dreyer, and André Sonnichsen. 2014. “Discourse, the political and the ontological dimension: an interview with Ernesto Laclau.” *Distinktion: Scandinavian Journal of Social Theory* 15, no. 3: 255–62.
- Howarth, David. 2014. *Ernesto Laclau: Post-Marxism, Populism, and Critique*. New York: Routledge.
- Laclau, Ernesto, and Chantal Mouffe. 1985. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.
- Laclau, Ernesto. 1990. *New Reflections on the Revolution of Our Time*. London: Verso.
- Laclau, Ernesto. 1996. *Emancipation(s)*. London: Verso.
- Laclau, Ernesto. 2005. *On Populist Reason*. London: Verso.
- Marchart, Oliver. 2014. “Institution and Dislocation: Philosophical Roots of Laclau's Discourse Theory of Space and Antagonism.” *Distinktion: Scandinavian Journal of Social Theory* 15, no. 3: 271–82.
- Townshend, Jules. 2003. “Discourse Theory and Political Analysis: A New Paradigm from the Essex School?” *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 5, no. 1: 129–42.
- Veltmeyer, Henry. 2000. “Post-Marxist Project: An Assessment and Critique of Ernesto Laclau.” *Sociological Inquiry* 70, no. 4: 499–519.
- Critchley, Simon, and Oliver Marchart. 2012. *Laclau: A Critical Reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Jessop, Bob. 2019. “Critical Discourse Analysis in Laclau and Mouffe's Post-Marxism.” *Simbiótica. Revista Eletrônica* 6, no. 2: 8–30.
- Torring, Jacob. 1999. *New Theories of Discourse: Laclau, Mouffe, and Zizek*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Further readings

See also

Chantal Mouffe; Hegemony; Socialism; Post-Marxism

189. Lefebvre, Henri

Henri Lefebvre (b. June 16, 1901–d. June 29, 1991) was a prolific Marxist philosopher whose writing offers an invaluable contribution to a critical understanding of space, power, and everyday life. Lefebvre earned a degree in Philosophy at the University of Paris (1920). In 1961, Lefebvre joined the University of Strasbourg as a Professor of Sociology. He moved to Paris Nanterre University in 1965, where he spent the remainder of his academic career.

In addition to an accomplished career as an academic, Lefebvre was also directly involved in many of the major political movements of his time. In the 1940s, he joined the French resistance to fight the Nazi occupation of France. He also served as the leading intellectual of the French Communist Party until his increasingly anti-Stalinist and unorthodox theoretical positions led to his expulsion from the PCF in 1958. In the 1960s, Lefebvre developed a close relationship with the Situationists (including a deep friendship with Guy Debord), as well as other emerging avant-garde movements in France. He was also an early advocate of the New Left, whose spontaneity and self-organization set them apart from conventional party-centered politics. In fact, Lefebvre was one of the few professors at Nanterre that sought to encourage and understand the explosive student rebellion of 1968 (Merrifield 2006; Kipfer et al. 2008).

Lefebvre's oeuvre – which includes nearly 70 books – contains contributions to philosophy, sociology, history, architecture, urban studies, and political thought. While he was first and foremost a Marxist, his Marxism was never rigid; it was always living and evolving. Lefebvre was a critic of Stalinism and other visions of socialism that venerated economic productivism and state power. Instead, he wielded the insights of Marx's earlier (and more humanist) writings to criticize alienation at the level of everyday life. This theoretical undertaking is manifested in Lefebvre's expansive four-volume series *Critique of Everyday Life*, the last of which was written shortly before his death.

Lefebvre is most famous for his contributions to urban and spatial theory. He was at the forefront of the spatial turn within the Marxist tradition (Soja 1989). In the late

1960s and early 1970s, he wrote extensively about cities as sites of capitalist reproduction, as well as their emergent revolutionary potential. Lefebvre explores these themes in *The Right to the City* (1968), *The Urban Revolution* (1970), and *Marxist Thought and the City* (1972). Perhaps his most impactful intervention, however, has been *The Production of Space* (1974). This ambitious book traces the social production of space through a triple dialectic, which accounts for the material, representational, and lived dimensions of space. These three dimensions are inspired by Lefebvre's three major philosophical influences: Marx (material), Hegel (representational), and Nietzsche (experiential). The unstable, yet generative combination of these three thinkers animates much of Lefebvre's work (Schmid 2008).

While Lefebvre's writing on cities and space was not particularly popular upon its original publication in France, it had a significant impact on the Anglo-American spatial disciplines after its translation into English. In France, Lefebvre's work was at odds with the highly popular structuralist account of urbanism espoused by Manuel Castells. Despite his initial marginalization at home, Lefebvre was introduced to English-speaking audiences by scholars like David Harvey and Edward Soja. Today, Lefebvre's concepts of the production of space and the right to the city have become integral to critical geography, architecture, and urban planning literatures (Kipfer et al. 2008). His work has left an unmistakable mark on publications like *Antipode: A Radical Journal of Geography*.

In addition to his work on the alienation of everyday life and capitalist spatial production, Lefebvre also pointed towards the possibility of emergent political and economic alternatives. This is most evident in his theorizing of *autogestion* – loosely translated as “self-management” – in which people reclaim direct, collective control over their everyday life. He juxtaposed this form of grassroots self-organization to the homogenizing power of the state and capitalism. In many ways, Lefebvre's vision of autogestion served as a radically democratic alternative to the failures of state socialism. This vision, as Lefebvre himself noted in an essay entitled “Theoretical Problems of Autogestion,” resonates with certain elements of anarchist thought. However, Lefebvre always understood himself as a Marxist, albeit an unortho-

dox one. When someone once asked whether he was an anarchist, he quipped: “No I’m a Marxist, of course, so that one day we can all become anarchists!” (Merrifield 2006, xxvi).

ALEX FARRINGTON

References

- Kipfer, Stefan, Kanishka Goonewardena, Richard Milgrom, and Christian Schmid. 2008. “On the Production of Henri Lefebvre.” In *Space, Difference, Everyday Life: Reading Henri Lefebvre*, edited by Kanishka Goonewardena, Stefan Kipfer, Richard Milgrom, and Christian Schmid, 1–25. New York: Routledge.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 1991 [1974]. *The Production of Space*, translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 1996 [1968]. “The Right to the City.” In *Writings on Cities*, edited by Eleonore Kofman, and Elizabeth Lebas, 147–59. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 2003 [1970]. *The Urban Revolution*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 2004 [1992]. *Rhythmanalysis: Space, Time, and Everyday Life*. New York: Continuum.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 2009 [1966]. “Theoretical Problems of Autogestion.” In *State, Space, World: Selected Essays*, edited by Neil Brenner and Stuart Elden, 138–52. Minneapolis: University Of Minnesota Press.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 2016 [1972]. *Marxist Thought and the City*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 2014. *Critique of Everyday Life: The One-Volume Edition*. London: Verso.
- Merrifield, Andy. 2006. *Henri Lefebvre: A Critical Introduction*. New York: Routledge.
- Schmid, Christian. 2008. “Henri Lefebvre’s Theory of the Production of Space.” In *Space, Difference, Everyday Life: Reading Henri Lefebvre*, edited by Kanishka Goonewardena, Stefan Kipfer, Richard Milgrom, and Christian Schmid, 27–46. New York: Routledge.
- Soja, Edward W. 1989. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. New York: Verso.

See also

Marxism; Alienation; Manuel Castells; Guy Debord

190. Love, Nancy S.

Nancy Sue Love (b. 1954–present) is a political theorist known for engaging with the Frankfurt School of Critical Theory, especially Habermas, and as a leader and editor within the Caucus for a Critical Political Science (CCPS). Born in Beaufort, South Carolina, she earned a B.A. in Political Science from Kenyon College, and a Ph.D. in Government from Cornell University. Her dissertation on Marx and Nietzsche was supervised by Allen Wood. Isaac Kramnick and Susan Buck-Morss also served on her dissertation committee. Love taught in the Political Science Department at the Pennsylvania State University from 1984 to 2009, when she left to become Professor of Political Science and Justice Studies at Appalachian State University.

Love's first book, *Marx, Nietzsche, and Modernity* (1986) reads Marx's critique of capitalist alienation and Nietzsche's critique of ascetic ideals as overlapping but ultimately incompatible critiques of modernity. She argues that Marx and Nietzsche share a dialectical idea of truth as historically conditioned knowledge. Yet, they offer conflicting responses to the problems of modernity: Marx offering socialized and productive solutions, Nietzsche offering individualistic and aesthetic ones. Love concludes that attempts to synthesize these critiques will end up emphasizing the worst elements of each thinker.

Since the 1990s, Love's primary research has focused on politics and aesthetics, with specific emphasis on music. In addition to numerous articles on the issue, she has published *Musical Democracy* (2006), which explores the use of musical metaphors in political theory and also the use of music in the American Civil Rights and feminist movements. She argues that democratic theory tends to privilege rational deliberation and consequently fails to attend to embodied forms of communication that prove essential to democratic mobilizations. In specific chapters on Habermas and Rawls, she reads the persistence of musical metaphors throughout their work as evidence of the enduring salience of embodied and affective expression, even among thinkers privileging rational deliberation.

Love's next book, *Trendy Fascism: White Power Music and the Future of Democracy* (2016), turns attention away from democratic theory and progressive movements to White Nationalist music and neo-fascist politics. Here Love draws on cultural theory, feminist theory, and historical political theory to argue that that neo-fascist cultural politics capitalize on an "aesthetic reason" that exceeds the rational and deliberative theories of political behavior. After chapters focusing on the overtly racist content of 1970s skin-heads, the more family-centered aesthetics of neo-Nazi folk music, and white supremacist heavy metal, Love argues that an effective democratic and anti-racist politics will have to confront the stories and memories consecrated in music. She notes that music has also been instrumental in successful efforts to rehabilitate white nationalists.

Love has served as President of the CCPS since 2017. Prior to this she co-edited, with Mark Mattern, the CCPS journal *New Political Science: A Journal of Politics and Culture* from 2008–14. The journal's visibility grew considerably during this time. Love and Mattern's collaboration also yielded two edited volumes: *Doing Democracy: Activist Art and Cultural Politics* (2013) and *Studying Politics Today: Critical Approaches to Political Science* (2014).

Love is also editor of a popular reader on ideologies, *Dogmas & Dreams* (2011) and author of a companion volume, *Understanding Dogmas & Dreams* (2006). She is also the editor of the book series "Critical Thinking and Contemporary Politics" with DeGruyter Publishers.

When Love announced her intention to resign from Penn State, the Political Science Department decided to eliminate political theory as a field of graduate study despite the department's impressive record of placing its political theory graduate students in tenure track positions. A discipline-wide controversy ensued, generating roundtables and symposia dedicated to examining the role of political theory within Political Science. A petition signed by dozens of political scientists and theorists asserted that a Political Science graduate program without classes in political theory would fail to attract talented students or adequately train scholars, while one high-profile essay argued that "normative political theory" (which Love's work undoubtedly represents) is "not political

science” and belongs in the humanities rather than the social sciences (Rehfeld 2010). This debate, which was published in the APSA journal dedicated to the relationship of the profession to the broader public, echoed Sheldon Wolin’s (1967) argument that political theory was being marginalized by a discipline increasingly focused on “method.” The Penn State decision, and some of the disciplinary commentary that ensued, precipitated Love’s becoming more active in the CCPS.

Love’s work has been recognized with awards and fellowships from a number of organizations, including the American Association of University Women, The American Association of University Professors, The American Council of Learned Societies, and the Woodrow Wilson Foundation. In 2022, she received the Donald W. Sink Family Outstanding Scholar award from the College of Arts and Sciences at Appalachian State.

CHAD LAVIN

References

- Love, Nancy S. 1986. *Marx, Nietzsche, and Modernity*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Love, Nancy S. 2006. *Understanding Dogmas & Dreams: A Text*, 2nd edn. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Love, Nancy S. 2006. *Musical Democracy*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Love, Nancy S. 2011. *Dogmas & Dreams: A Reader of Modern Political Ideologies*, 4th edn. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Love, Nancy S. 2016. *Trendy Fascism: White Power Music and the Future of Democracy*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Love, Nancy S. and Mark Mattern, eds. 2013. *Doing Democracy: Activist Art and Cultural Politics*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Love, Nancy S. and Mark Mattern, eds. 2014. *Studying Politics Today: Critical Approaches to Political Science*. NY: Routledge.

Further readings

- Rehfeld, Andrew. 2010. “Offensive Political Theory.” *Perspectives on Politics* 8, no. 2 (June): 465–86.
- Wolin, Sheldon. 1967. “Political Theory as a Vocation.” *American Political Science Review* 63, no. 4 (December): 1062–82.

191. Luke, Timothy W.

Timothy W. Luke (b. 1951–present) is a political theorist whose work in modern critical theory has shaped conversations across the social sciences and humanities. Luke was born in Phoenix, Arizona, but raised in rural Arizona and his attachment to the southwestern United States is evident throughout his work. Luke's writing is rooted in the interconnection of space/place, built structures, human and non-human life, and Indigenous and Mexican-American history and culture.

Luke earned a B.A. in Government and English (1972) and M.A. in Political Science (1975) from the University of Arizona. He completed an M.A. (1977) and Ph.D. (1981) in Political Science at Washington University in St. Louis, where he studied under Carl Boggs, John H. Kautsky, Victor T. Levine, and Paul Piccone. As the editor of *Telos*, Piccone invited many radical scholars from Michel Foucault to Herbert Marcuse to the university, where Alvin Gouldner, William H. Gass, and Barry Commoner also taught. During this time, Luke began writing and editing for *New German Critique* and *Telos*, while he wrote a dissertation on Bolshevik intellectuals, proletarian culture, and Soviet industrialization. His early writings focused on comparative communist politics, national liberation movements, and international political economy.

Luke joined the political science faculty at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Virginia Tech) in 1981. He served as Chair of the Russian and Soviet Area Studies Program (1985–88), Chair of the Department of Political Science (1991–92, 2001–02, 2010–16, 2019–present), Founding Director of the interdisciplinary Ph.D. program named the Alliance for Social, Political, Ethical, and Cultural Thought (ASPECT) (2003–05), Program Chair for Government and International Affairs (2003–16), Senior Fellow of the Arts, Humanities, and the Social Sciences for the Office of the Provost (2003–16), and University Distinguished Professor (1999–present). Luke established the Center for Digital Discourse and served as the first Executive Director of Virginia Tech's Institute of Distance and Distributed Learning (1998 – 2001). He established the first asynchronous online M.A. program in political science in the United States (1997).

Throughout his career, Luke has developed systematic critiques of advanced industrial society at the intersections of politics, economics, culture, and ecology. Drawing upon a wide array of influences, such as the Frankfurt School of Critical Theory, Schmittian critiques of liberal politics, and radical anarchist traditions, Luke's prolific writing often situates what might seem like the minutiae of everyday life to expose the obfuscation of power, privilege, and injustice that are destructive to society, but that lurk behind seemingly innocuous objects, practices, and social relations (*Interstitial Journal*, 2013).

Luke has supported many critical political science publications. He joined the Editorial Production Committee of the Caucus for a New Political Science in 1982 and, since that time, he has supported the organization and its journal, *New Political Science* in various leadership roles (Editorial Production Committee 1982–93; Book Reviews Editor 1983–93; Editorial Board 1993–2008; Associate Editor 2008–present). Luke is the Book Line Editor for Telos Press Publishing (2006–present), and has served on its editorial board since 1980. He is also a founding co-editor of *Fast Capitalism* (2005–15; sole editor 2015–18, co-editor 2018–present) and serves in various editorial positions at other critical journals, such as *Capitalism Nature Socialism*, *Critical Policy Studies*, *Current Perspectives in Social Theory*, *International Political Sociology*, *Organization & Environment*, and *Peace Studies Journal*.

Luke's scholarship can be broadly characterized as North American Critical Theory. Luke has published articles in *Capitalism Nature Socialism*, *New Political Science*, and *Telos*, that articulate critiques of neoliberalism, which draw from "first generation" Frankfurt School critical theorists, but go beyond this starting point to incorporate insights from Jean Baudrillard, Antonio Gramsci, and Michel Foucault as an alternative to the "communicative turn" articulated by Habermas (Luke 1994). Luke's theoretical work is grounded in interdisciplinary engagement and he has written extensively on a range of topics, including cyberculture and information politics, aesthetic politics, ideology critique, political economy, and ecological politics.

In the 1980s, Luke began mapping how digital technologies capture and use infor-

mation through (now ubiquitous) screens as cultural circuits of domination. *Screens of Power: Ideology, Domination and Resistance in Informational Society* (1989, 2020) describes the shift from the totalizing logic of advanced industrial society (Marcuse 1964) to an “information society” that is decentered, accelerated, and discursively constructed. Luke’s (2020) engagement with semiotics and the society of the spectacle is engaged to illustrate the central role of information in modern forms of production.

In *Shows of Force: Power, Politics, and Ideology in Art Exhibitions* (1992) and *Museum Politics: Power Plays at the Exhibition* (2002), Luke evinces an awareness of how the display of art and the preparation of exhibitions conceals power relations and normalizes values that influence political structures, public policy outcomes, and economic investment through these discourses. Luke’s innovative reading of art and the materiality of how it is displayed goes beyond mere art criticism and empty statements about the aesthetic “power of art” on individuals to reveal its display as a form of political maneuver. Luke’s aesthetic politics demands that social scientists consider what is hidden in seemingly everyday forms of art and how these reify structures of power and the dominant ideologies that legitimate that power.

However, Luke (1997) is best known for his ecological writing and establishing a method of “ecocritique” that he outlined in an eponymous book. Luke (2005) criticizes liberal and neoliberal responses to the modern environmental movement, and he consistently challenges the role of mainstream narratives of sustainability that often uphold power structures designed to insulate the affluent from environmental harms, while maintaining a system of sustainable degradation more generally. Luke’s early writing on this subject anticipated much of the current discussion of the Anthropocene. More recently, *Anthropocene Alerts: Critical Theory of the Contemporary as Ecocritique* (2020) collects Luke’s writing on this topic from the end of the 1970s to the early 2020s and outlines the contestations of the politics of nature, economy, and society as a core concern of critical theory.

Luke attributes his training in cultural studies, journalism, and literary studies

during high school and college as influences on his eclectic style of writing. A prolific publisher, Luke has authored over a dozen books and hundreds of chapters, articles, and essays. His scholarship has been recognized through numerous awards, including national and international grants and fellowships, and the Charles A. McCoy Career Achievement Award from the New Political Science Section of the American Political Science Association (2014). Luke continues to influence the next generation of critical scholars as he has chaired dozens of Master’s theses and doctoral dissertations, while serving as a mentor to many in the community of critical political science.

SARAH M. SURAK

References

- Editors of the *Interstitial Journal*. 2013. “Nonnatural Politics: An Interview with Timothy Luke.” <https://interstitialjournal.files.wordpress.com/2013/07/luke-interview.pdf>.
- Luke, Timothy W. 1994. “Toward a North American Critical Theory.” *Telos*, no. 101: 101–08.
- Luke, Timothy W. 1992. *Shows of Force: Power Plays at the Exhibition*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Luke, Timothy W. 2002. *Museum Politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Luke, Timothy W. 2005. “Neither Sustainable nor Development: Reconsidering Sustainability in Development.” *Sustainable Development* 13, no. 4: 228–38.
- Luke, Timothy W. 2020. “Staying Alert During the Great Acceleration: Anthropocene Ahead.” *New Political Science* 42, no. 4: 595–601.
- Marcuse, Herbert. 1964. *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Nickel, Patricia Mooney. 2012. “Timothy W. Luke.” In *North American Critical Theory After Postmodernism: Contemporary Dialogues*, edited by Patricia Mooney Nickel, 14–41. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Further readings

- Luke, Timothy W. 1985. *Ideology and Soviet Industrialization*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Luke, Timothy W. 1990. *Social Theory and Modernity: Critique, Dissent and Revolution*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Luke, Timothy W. 2021. *The Travails of Trumpification*. Candor, NY: Telos Press Publishing.

192. Lustig, R. Jeffrey

R. Jeffrey Lustig (1943–2012) was an incisive political theorist and an inspiring teacher and colleague. He was also a lifelong activist, dedicated to social justice, participatory democracy, liberal education, and university self-governance. Lustig received B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. degrees in political science from the University of California, Berkeley. After several temporary academic appointments, he spent the last two decades of his career at California State University, Sacramento, where he was a tenured professor. For many years he also taught periodically at Deep Springs College in the high desert of Eastern California. Lustig was the founding chair of the California Studies Association (1990–98) and director of the Center for California Studies (1989–94). He served as president of the Sacramento chapter of his faculty union, the California Faculty Association (1997–2003), and as secretary of the statewide CFA (1999–2001).

Lustig's *Corporate Liberalism* (1982) is a major work in American Political Thought. Among other things, it asks why much of the opposition to civil rights workers, antiwar protesters, and others defending liberal ideals in the 1960s came from within liberalism itself. Lustig locates an answer in the corporate liberalism that emerged in the early twentieth century. For Lustig, corporate liberalism is a cultural logic based on unaccountable hierarchy, instrumental reason, and arbitrary power. Pragmatist and Progressive thinkers sought to modernize liberalism, Lustig argues, but they were naïvely optimistic that improving formal procedures of communication would adequately address the basic moral conflicts and social costs of corporate capitalism. The result was a set of theories that were “fundamentally apolitical, even antipolitical” (Lustig 1982, 171). Corporate liberalism fails to address basic questions of social meaning and political legitimacy. “Hence liberalism also winds up repudiating its own values: free opportunities are replaced by ‘socializing conditions,’ laws by executive orders, rights by duties, morality by police, and citizens, finally, by subjects” (Lustig 1982, 260).

Lustig's critique of corporate liberalism was never merely academic. As a student at UC Berkeley, he joined the 1964 Free

Speech Movement (FSM), and it remained a touchstone for his later work. Inspired by civil rights activists, the movement went beyond defending free speech on campus to boldly challenge the emerging corporate model of the university as a privatized and commercialized “knowledge factory.” During the FSM, Lustig (2002, 218) later wrote: “We began to insist that the original and still primary purpose of public higher education was political, in the broadest sense, not economic. It was to prepare people for democratic citizenship.”

Against the widespread view of students as customers, intent on maximizing their market value, Lustig defended the liberal arts tradition of education for intellectual autonomy and self-development. Rather than the philosophical branch of this tradition, which seeks truth for its own sake, Lustig (2005, 38) emphasized a distinctly political approach that helps students to “critically appraise their traditions and open their eyes to other cultures.” Administrators often insist on immediate and measurable results, Lustig (2010a, 10) noted, while liberal arts education often takes years to bear fruit. “We faculty are in the seed wafting business, the silent breeze business. (Which is not the same as the hot air business).” Lustig (2005, 39) also argued that universities require a sense of community, because productive discussion and disagreement depend on mutual trust and respect. And in contrast to the liberal view of academic freedom as protection from outside interference, Lustig (2005, 40) called for a republican conception of academic freedom as collective self-governance: “Academic freedom entails not only immunities, then, but also capacities – not only a freedom *from* power but a freedom, and obligation, to be part *of* power.” Or as he made the point in a campus award lecture, “We need to become activist professionals, or we will cease to be professionals at all” (2010a, 20).

Lustig often argued that freedom and democracy depend on various social and material conditions. Freedom means little without political education, good jobs, social solidarity, local community, and a healthy relationship with nonhuman nature. In a trenchant essay on race and class, Lustig (2004) criticized both liberal colorblindness and the elite appropriation of identity politics in the name of “diversity.” Race and class are intertwined, he argued, and the social

privileges of whiteness blind many white people to their own economic vulnerability: "Class questions cannot be raised because the groups that might raise them remain divided between racializers and the racialized, fighting in a box without questioning the existence of the box itself" (Lustig 2004, 56). Most importantly, no social or economic category can provide an automatic source of political membership or authority. Therefore, Lustig (2004, 57) wrote, "Creating unity between different subordinate groups, developing different forms of class consciousness in each, and framing an alternative vision that can unite them ... can only be accomplished through political struggle."

Lustig's commitment to political struggle did not prevent him from seeing a need for effective state institutions. In his edited volume *Remaking California* (2010b), Lustig brought together a broad mix of authors to examine the myriad crises facing his home state: low voting rates among disadvantaged groups, social inequality, ecological destruction, and the extreme constraints on lawmakers imposed by ballot initiatives, privatized public services, and powerful interest groups. Lustig (2010b, 17) suggested that "to preserve their liberties, citizens need political authority strong enough to preserve the material preconditions for those liberties and to defend their rights against private encroachment."

Lustig saw a promising remedy in constitutional reforms, aimed in part to support local participatory forums where people could learn the skills and habits of self-government.

MARK B. BROWN

References

- Lustig, R. Jeffery. 1982. *Corporate Liberalism: The Origins of Modern American Political Theory, 1890-1920*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lustig, Jeff. 2002. "The FSM and the Vision of a New Left." In *The Free Speech Movement: Reflections on Berkeley in the 1960s*, edited by Robert Cohen and Reginald E. Zelnik, 215-26. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lustig, R. Jeffery. 2004. "The Tangled Knot of Race and Class in America." In *What's Class Got to Do with It? American Society in the Twenty-First Century*, edited by Michael Zweig, 45-60. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Lustig, Jeff. 2005. "The University Revisioned: The Alternative to Corporate Mis-education." *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies* 27, no. 1: 17-52.
- Lustig, Jeff. 2010a. "The University Besieged." *Thought & Action: The NEA Higher Education Journal* (Fall): 7-22.
- Lustig, R. Jeffery. 2010b. "California at the Edge." In *Remaking California: Reclaiming the Public Good*, edited by R. Jeffery Lustig, 3-22. Berkeley, CA: Heyday Books.

193. Lyotard, Jean-François

Jean-François Lyotard (b. August 10, 1924–d. April 21, 1998) was born and educated in Paris, France. A lycée student during the Nazi occupation of France, he subsequently studied Philosophy at the Sorbonne, completing the *agrégation* in 1950. His first posting was to teach in Constantine, then the capital of a French département in East Algeria. This short but politically formative period ended when Lyotard returned to mainland France with his young family in 1952. He taught at a regional lycée in the Pays de la Loire until 1959 when he moved to teach in Paris – initially at the Sorbonne then, in 1966, at Nanterre.

Having become politically active in Algeria, Lyotard joined the radical left-wing group Socialisme ou Barbarie. He began to write for the group's eponymous journal in 1956 and was involved in clandestine assistance given to the Algerian nationalists during the struggle for independence (1954–62). Lyotard contributed thirteen essays to the journal, documenting the events in Algeria and commenting on their impact, both politically and economically, as part of the situational analysis, which was central to the group's discussions. When a split within the group took place in 1964, Lyotard joined a breakaway faction, Pouvoir ouvrier, which he left two years later. This was the end of Lyotard's life as a dedicated activist, at the heart of a small but influential political group, though his engagement continued through his writings and philosophical activities.

Lyotard was teaching at Nanterre at the time of the 1968 events and in 1970 he became part of the Philosophy Department at the Experimental University Centre, Vincennes (later the University of Paris VIII), where he remained until 1987. A frequent visiting professor to Universities in North America from the early 1970s, he time-shared a post with Jacques Derrida and Wolfgang Iser at the University of California, Irvine (1987–94), and subsequently held a professorship at Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia. Lyotard was significantly involved in the Collège International de Philosophie in Paris throughout the 1980s and 1990s.

Lyotard is perhaps best known for his writings on the postmodern, especially *The Postmodern Condition* ([1979] 1984) which gained international attention. This short “report on knowledge” as it is subtitled, reflected on changes in post-industrial societies and the increased marketization of knowledge, famously summarized by the description of “performativity” as maximizing output whilst minimizing input. Written on commission for the Council of Universities of the semi-autonomous province of Quebec, Canada, it pre-empts many of the more complex philosophical ideas presented in his important book *The Differend* ([1983]1988). Developing and departing from Ludwig Wittgenstein's “language games,” Lyotard analyses competing modes of discourse with attention to both the imbalance between genres of discourse and the extent to which particular regimes of phrases follow pre-existing rules to achieve set goals. Phrases, or sentences, are not limited to the linguistic phrase; neither is the human given priority in uttering or eliciting phrases. It is this avoidance of human exceptionalism and anthropocentrism that distances Lyotard from traditional linguistics and ordinary language philosophers, and emphasizes his relevance to contemporary ecological debates.

What particularly concerns Lyotard in *The Differend* is that which language is unable to say: the instance when the only phrase that is presented is silence. What silence might signify, what role it might play, and what injustice might arise from its misattribution as the refusal or inability to speak is central to the ethical problematics being evoked throughout the book. A “differend” is the state where two phrase regimes cannot be reconciled without irreparable damage being done to one or more party. One of many examples given by Lyotard is that of the Martinican who, as a French citizen, can bring complaints under French law on all matters affecting their rights as a French citizen, except the complaint of being a French citizen. This is an instance of a differend arising from the phrase universe of Ideas, whereby “there exists no procedures instituted to establish or refute their reality in the cognitive sense” (Lyotard 1988, 27), thus resulting in a wrong which cannot be expressed except as a differend. How differends are expressed, voiced through the location of a new idiom is the challenge presented

by Lyotard's work, a task which must be on-going by necessity.

Presented with the task of collecting his writings on Algeria from *Socialisme ou Barbarie* for the French publisher Galilée in 1989, Lyotard reflected on the situation in terms of the group's commitment to "the intractable." It is that which cannot be absorbed by the system, the debt which continues to refuse assimilation and which should be pursued still, if not by Marxism then by other means, as a testament to that which is the result of a differend.

KIFF BAMFORD

References

- Lyotard, Jean-François. 1984 [1979]. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, translated by Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lyotard, Jean-François. 1988 [1983]. *The Differend: Phrases in Dispute*, translated by Georges Van Den Abbeele. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Further readings

- Bamford, Kiff. 2017. *Jean-François Lyotard: Critical Lives*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Lyotard, Jean-François. 1993. *Political Writings*, translated by Bill Readings and Kevin Paul Geiman. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Williams, James. 2000. *Lyotard and the Political*. London and New York: Routledge.

See also

Post-Structuralism; Postmodernism; Critical Theory; Marxism

194. Macdonald, Bradley J.

Bradley J. Macdonald (b. 1959, New York–) is a Professor of Political Science at Colorado State University (1993–present). He previously taught at the University of North Carolina, Greensboro (1991–93) and California State University, Long Beach (1990–91). He received a B.A. in Political Science at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and his M.A. and Ph.D. in Political Science at the University of California, Los Angeles, where he worked with the political theorist Richard E. Ashcraft (1938–96). Ashcraft's (1980) concept of "political theory as ideology" became an important position within general discussions of the nature and method of political theory in the late twentieth century. For Ashcraft, political theory is intimately tied to the actual struggles of historical political actors and provides a way for political actors (and theorists) to understand the political world around them and to act within it to secure their values, goals, or visions of political life. Once political theory is grounded in the actual exigencies of political action, one can then see how a wide variety of practices, discourses and media are actively and importantly political. For Macdonald, in particular, such a position allows one to see the particularly interesting way that art and popular culture can be political.

In his first book, Macdonald (1999) looks specifically at the genealogy of William Morris's revolutionary socialism to argue that his early commitment to an aestheticist position on art – a position which argues that art's only purpose was to create beauty – is important to the process of clarifying the ways that other political actors were becoming politicized via their commitment to and thinking about art. According to Macdonald, Morris developed a critical notion of beauty that led him to argue that in socialism art must flourish in everyday life. Moreover, for Macdonald, the intricate relationship Morris articulated between beauty, pleasurable labor, and socialism made him one of the first eco-socialist thinkers, ultimately conveying a provocative conception of the imbrication of socialism and ecological regeneration

in his essays and literary work (Macdonald 2004, 2011).

With Morris, Macdonald saw an illustration of the way in which political actors were using aesthetic discourses and artistic practices to develop their political subjectivities. This is a clear example of what Macdonald (1990) calls "cultural politics," or the way in which art and/or popular culture reinforces and/or resists relations of power, and helps in the constitution of political self-understandings and actions. Macdonald (1998) would also turn to looking at the increasingly ubiquitous phenomena of graffiti writing in urban areas, particularly in Los Angeles, to argue that "tagging" becomes an important form of resistance and identity formation for marginalized communities within the power formations of urban space.

While at UCLA, Macdonald co-founded and edited the journal, *Strategies: A Journal of Theory, Culture, and Politics* (1988–2003), an interdisciplinary political theory journal that took seriously the various forms of critical theory (Marxist, Post-Marxist, and Post-Modern) then circulating and confronting each other within the social sciences and the humanities. In its pages, and during its short existence, the journal published innovative essays from a variety of well-known theorists, including Slavoj Žižek, William Connolly, Susan Buck-Morse, Ernesto Laclau, Henry Giroux, and Linda Nicholson. It was from this discursive arena that Macdonald began to formulate his own engagement with the Marxist tradition which would come out clearly in *Performing Marx: Contemporary Negotiations of a Living Tradition* (2006). For Macdonald, Marxism as a living tradition demands that participants both establish continuities and discontinuities between their ideas and Marx's, and Macdonald took seriously this particular metatheoretical commitment in his analysis of the work of Marx, William Morris, Guy Debord and the situationists, Michel Foucault, Antonio Negri, and Ernesto Laclau.

While engaging a variety of theorists in relation to the Marxist tradition, Macdonald has also revisited the particular version of critical theory associated with the Frankfurt School, looking closely at the work of Max Horkheimer (2017), Theodor Adorno (2012, 2018), and Herbert Marcuse (2013, 2018) in terms of clarifying and articulating a notion of critical political science, devel-

oping a notion of scholar-activism that can contest the pitfalls of the neoliberal university, elucidating an alterglobalist non-identity politics, and investigating the post-911 configurations of a defense society in the U.S., with its attendant emplacement of a continual state of exception. With the rise of right-wing populism in the U.S. and globally, Macdonald (2021) (with Katherine Young) has revisited the ideas of the first generation of the Frankfurt School in order to look at the always ready authoritarianism that exists within the seemingly secure parameters of liberal democracy. With the rise of Trumpism in the U.S., the Frankfurt School's keen appraisal of the interrelationship between individual psychodynamics, ideological discourses reinforced in the culture industry, and the devastating consequences of neoliberal capitalist development are still highly relevant, and can help to understand the current threats to democracy and justice, but also clarify the possible pathways of resistance, contestation, and emancipatory actions.

CLYDE W. BARROW

References

- Ashcraft, Richard. 1980. "Political Theory and the Problem of Ideology." *The Journal of Politics* 42, no. 3 (August): 687–705.
- Macdonald, Bradley J. 1990. "Political Theory and Cultural Criticism: Towards a Theory of Cultural Politics." *History of Political Thought* 11, no. 3: 509–29.
- Macdonald, Bradley J. 1998. "Border Signs: Graffiti, Contested Identities and Everyday Resistance in Los Angeles." In *The U.S.-Mexico Border: Transcending Divisions, Contesting Identities*, edited by D. Spener and K. Staudt, 169–84. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Macdonald, Bradley J. 1999. *William Morris and the Aesthetic Constitution of Politics*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Macdonald, Bradley J. 2004. "William Morris and the Vision of Ecosocialism." *Contemporary Justice Review* 7, no. 3: 287–304.
- Macdonald, Bradley J. 2006. *Performing Marx: Contemporary Negotiations of a Living Tradition*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Macdonald, Bradley J. 2011. "Morris After Marcuse: Art, Beauty, and the Aestheticist Position in Ecosocialism." *The Journal of William Morris Studies* (Winter): 39–49.
- Macdonald, Bradley J. 2012. "Theodor Adorno, Alterglobalization, and Non-Identity Politics." *New Political Science* 34, no. 3 (September): 321–37.
- Macdonald, Bradley J. 2013. "Marcuse, States of Exception, and the Defense Society." *Radical Philosophy Review* 16, no. 1: 253–66.
- Macdonald, Bradley J. 2017. "Traditional and Critical Theory Today: Toward a Critical Political Science." *New Political Science* 39, no. 4 (December): 511–22.
- Macdonald, Bradley J. and Katherine E. Young. 2018. "Adorno and Marcuse at the Barricades? Critical Theory, Scholar-Activism, and the Neoliberal University." *New Science* 40, no. 3: 528–41.
- Macdonald, Bradley J. and Katherine E. Young. 2021. "Critical Theory, Fascism, and Antifascism: Reflections from a Damaged Polity." *Emancipations: A Journal of Critical Social Analysis* 1, no. 3: Article 3.

195. MacKinnon, Catharine A.

Catharine A. MacKinnon (b. October 7, 1946–) is an influential American radical feminist, legal scholar, political theorist, and lawyer. She was born in Minneapolis, Minnesota in 1946 and pursued her undergraduate education in Government at Smith College. She was one of a few female law students at Yale, where she completed her J.D. in 1977; indeed, in her class of 165, there were only around 15 women (Fiss 2018, 119). MacKinnon stayed at Yale for her Ph.D. (1987) in Political Science. She has been the Elizabeth A. Long Professor of Law at the University of Michigan for over three decades and has been a visiting professor at multiple national and international institutions. Since 2009, she's been the James Barr Ames Visiting Professor of Law at Harvard Law School. She is known for her scholarly work on sexual harassment, pornography, and sexual violence, as well as her activist work in these areas in both national and international political and legal forums.

MacKinnon's scholarly contributions to critical political science are immense, and concern both legal feminism and feminist political theory. While still in law school, she paid close attention to activists at Cornell University who coined the term "sexual harassment" – which described a phenomenon that nearly all women in the paid work force understood – and began to research how to oppose sexual harassment using the American legal system. MacKinnon's *Sexual Harassment of Working Women* (1979) was the first book to make the legal argument that sexual harassment is a form of sex discrimination. *Feminism Unmodified* (1987) examined the early development of sexual harassment law, in addition to laying out her views on pornography and sexual violence (specifically rape). MacKinnon made the then-novel (but now widely accepted) argument that the law's early recognition of exclusively "quid pro quo" types of sexual harassment obscured the far greater problem of "women's real experience[s] of violation" in the workplace (1987, 116), or in today's parlance, hostile work environments. MacKinnon's *Toward a Feminist Theory of the State* (1989), a revised version of her doctoral dissertation, is her best-known work of political theory. In

this book, MacKinnon used the relationship between Marxism and feminism as a jumping off point for theorizing women's subordination – again, with a heavy emphasis on pornography and rape – and applies that relationship to the state. For MacKinnon, the liberal state and everything it entails (including the law, jurisprudence, and the constitution) presents itself as neutral but is actually male; in other words, the state constitutes a social order that represents the interests of men (1989, 162–70). One example of this is how deeply entrenched rape myths are in many institutions of the state. Although her scholarly contributions now tally over a dozen books and countless articles, MacKinnon's first three books remain her most famous and offer the best representation of her interests and approach.

MacKinnon is just as productive in her national and international activism as she is in her scholarship. She wrote the legal brief for the landmark SCOTUS case *Meritor Savings Bank v. Vinson* (1986), which established sexual harassment as sex discrimination. She represented Bosnian women survivors of Serbian war crimes in *Kadic et al. v. Karadzic* (1995), which established for the first time the legal recognition of rape as an act of genocide. She was the first Special Gender Adviser (2008–12) to the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court. She continues to consult today with various international legal and political institutions, including the United Nations.

Although MacKinnon has taken on the masculinism and liberalism underpinning mainstream political science, her legacy for critical political science remains controversial. Much of what is controversial stems from her longstanding view that the social construction of heterosexuality, masculinity, and femininity cannot be separated from violent dominance and subordination (1987, 148; 1989, 197; 2016, 474). For Wendy Brown, MacKinnon's "subject positions of male and female are ... relentlessly dualistic and absolute" (1995, 88). MacKinnon has also been critiqued for privileging gender as the most fundamental form of oppression while ignoring race, class, and other diverse identities, and disregarding the ways in which colonialism, slavery, and the Christian church have shaped modern law (Kapur 2002, 8–10). She has been critiqued for her well-known argument that not only is rape a form of "forced sex," but pornography and sex work are as

well (MacKinnon 1987, 148). She has been accused of presenting her understanding of pornography as the only appropriate feminist view, while ignoring feminist pornography and the positive experiences of some women in sex work (Bell, 1997, 200–01). Moreover, it has been suggested that her view that women cannot consent to any form of sex work and continued rejection of the term “sex work” itself (MacKinnon 2016, 448; MacKinnon 2021, A23) has ultimately led her to press for legal “solutions” that further marginalize the already marginalized. For example, her involvement in drafting an influential factum for the Supreme Court of Canada’s *R v. Butler* decision (1992) on pornography led to increased targeting of LGBTQ+ materials by Canadian customs officers and police (Gotell 1997, 89, 99; Cossman 1997). Her involvement with various “anti-trafficking” measures internationally ultimately leads to more criminalization of not only sex workers, but many women crossing borders for employment (Doezema 2005; Kempadoo 2015). Yet at the same time, it is important to appreciate that MacKinnon in many ways provided the intellectual foundation of the contemporary #MeToo movement many decades ago. Her involvement in the highly polarized “feminist sex wars” (on pornography and sex work) in the 1980s continues to this day, and she continues to press academic and activist feminists to clarify and sharpen their understandings of these issues.

JULIE E. DOWSETT

References

- Bell, Shannon. 1997. “On ne peut pas voir l’image [The image cannot be seen].” In *Bad Attitude/s on Trial: Pornography, Feminism, and the Butler Decision*, edited by Brenda Cossman, Shannon Bell, Lise Gotell, and Becki L. Ross, 199–242. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Brown, Wendy. 1995. *States of Injury: Power and Freedom in Late Modernity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Cossman, Brenda. 1997. “Feminist Fashion or Morality in Drag? The Sexual Subtext of the *Butler Decision*.” In *Bad Attitude/s on Trial: Pornography, Feminism, and the Butler Decision*, edited by Brenda Cossman, Shannon Bell, Lise Gotell, and Becki L. Ross, 107–51. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Doezema, Jo. 2005. ““Now You See Her, Now You Don’t: Sex Workers at the UN Trafficking Protocol Negotiations.” *Social & Legal Studies* 14, no. 1: 61–90.
- Fiss, Owen. 2018. *Pillars of Justice: Lawyers and the Liberal Tradition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gotell, Lise. 1997. “Shaping *Butler*: The New Politics of Anti-Pornography.” In *Bad Attitude/s On Trial: Pornography, Feminism, and the Butler Decision*, edited by Brenda Cossman, Shannon Bell, Lise Gotell, and Becki L. Ross, 48–106. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Kapur, Ratna. 2002. “The Tragedy of Victimization Rhetoric: Resurrecting the ‘Native’ Subject In International/Post-colonial Feminist Legal Politics.” *Harvard Human Rights Journal* 15: 1–38.
- Kempadoo, Kamala. 2015. “The Modern-Day White (Wo)Man’s Burden: Trends in Anti-Trafficking and Anti-Slavery Campaigns.” *Journal of Human Trafficking* 1, no. 1: 8–20.
- MacKinnon, Catharine A. 1987. *Feminism Unmodified: Discourses on Life and Law*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- MacKinnon, Catharine A. 2021. “OnlyFans Is Not a Safe Place for ‘Sex Work’.” *New York Times*, September 8.
- MacKinnon, Catharine A. 2016. “Rape Redefined.” *Harvard Law and Policy Review* 10, no. 2: 431–77.
- MacKinnon, Catharine A. 1979. *Sexual Harassment of Working Women: A Case of Sex Discrimination*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- MacKinnon, Catharine A. 1989. *Toward a Feminist Theory of the State*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bellafante, Ginia. 2018. “Before #MeToo, there was Catharine A. MacKinnon and Her Book *Sexual Harassment of Working Women*.” *New York Times*, March 19. www.nytimes.com/2018/03/19/books/review/metoo-workplace-sexual-harassment-catharine-mackinnon.html.
- Cossman, Brenda. 2021. *The New Sex Wars: Sexual Harm in the #MeToo Era*. New York: New York University Press.
- MacKinnon, Catharine A. 2007. “Rape, Genocide, and Women’s Human Rights.” In *Genocide and Human Rights*, edited by Mark Lattimer, 133–4. London: Routledge.

See also

Critical Legal Studies; Feminist Critiques of Political Science; Feminist Theory and the State

196. Macpherson, C.B.

Crawford Brough Macpherson (b. 1911, Toronto, d. 1987, Toronto) was a Canadian political theorist. He completed an undergraduate degree at the University of Toronto in 1932 and a graduate degree in 1935 at The London School of Economics under Harold Laski. He subsequently taught at the University of Toronto where, save for brief periods of time, he spent his entire career before retiring in 1982.

Macpherson's best-known books, *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism* (1962), *Democratic Theory: Essays in Retrieval* (1973), and *The Life and Times of Liberal Democracy* (1977), highlight his key themes: an appraisal of the strengths and limits of the English liberal tradition and its dominant conception of possessive individualism, whereby individuals were seen as infinitely desirous owners of themselves, owing nothing to society for the exercise of their capacities; and the development of a radical and participatory theory of democracy. Specifically, he sought to revise liberal democratic theory in order to make that theory more democratic, while rescuing those elements of liberalism submerged when it was identified with capitalist market relations.

Macpherson is typically understood as a Marxist, or quasi-Marxist, a critic of capitalism and a proponent of socialism. In conservative and mainstream academic commentary, he has been criticized for imputing without textual support possessive individualist assumptions to theorists such as Thomas Hobbes and John Locke that falsely identify them as bourgeois ideologues, rather than as powerful thinkers committed to universal values of reason and freedom. The so-called Cambridge School historians of political thought stand out as exemplary critics on this point.

By contrast, some on the left have claimed that Macpherson was too accommodating to a liberalism that has historically provided ideological justification for capitalism and, thus, he was insufficiently Marxist. Ellen Wood Meiksins offered the most representative critique of this kind. Regardless of their differences, most analysts have assumed that he was a typical political theorist who formulated logical, empirical, and historical arguments to establish a network of concepts that

he then used to define and defend radically democratic goals.

This line of thinking is accurate, as far as it goes, but there is a largely unrecognized political and methodological radicalism to Macpherson's work. He accomplished more with his "tools" of inquiry than his own use and explicit account of those tools suggest. His work bears an affinity with that of the Frankfurt School as he is more a critical rather than a traditional theorist. For Max Horkheimer, traditional theory took the form of a unified set of logical deductions from basic premises whose truth was guaranteed by the impartial vantage point of an external observer. By contrast, critical theory saw theory and the theorist as embedded in a dynamic socio-historical process that continuously transformed both theory and the theorist. Critical theory was practical: it both identified with, and offered an immanent critique of, the commitments and practices of socially situated agents in order to clarify from the participants' perspective the attempt to establish a rational social order adequate to human powers and needs. Its concepts possessed changing historical content, even as they retained common features over time. They were intended to provide social diagnoses and points of orientation in the present, not to ground causal predictions. They were interpretive rather than apodictic.

Two core elements of Macpherson's work highlight the critical dimension of his overall approach: his landmark account of possessive individualism; and his lesser known but important critique of mainstream political science. *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism* has a structure comparable to Volume One of Marx's *Capital*. While Marx developed a critique of political economy, Macpherson offered a critique of political theory. But both shared a common focus: the triumph of the commodity form and its meaning for human social relations.

In this context, possessive individualism is not a descriptive concept applied to the stated assumptions of political thinkers. It is, rather, an articulation or mediation, an achievement that emerged from Macpherson's reading of the tensions in liberal theory that can only be grasped from the vantage point of what we now know about the historical development of liberal, and later liberal democratic, capitalist society. It is an interpretation of what happened when the concepts, values

and aims of Hobbes, Locke and others in the liberal tradition – and the social forces that carried them – were realized across the board. Macpherson's alternative to possessive individualism, developmental individualism, which presented individuals not as infinite consumers or appropriators, but rather as doers and exerts of their distinctively human capacities, is another articulation, rooted in the response of theorists to the triumph of possessive market values and imperatives.

In this light, Macpherson's democratic theory emerged immanently from the critique of possessive individualism, and not apart from it. His radicalized liberal democracy is anchored in developmental individualism. Democracy is not just a mechanism for choosing and authorizing governments, but a kind of society in which all are equally able to use and develop their capacities.

While Macpherson devoted little explicit attention to questions of methodology or meta-methodology, he demonstrated considerable concern with political science as an intellectual and social practice. He explored the historical roots and theoretical commitments that determined the objects of research and the questions posed by organized political inquiry. He saw a social function beyond the disinterested quest for knowledge. He criticized political scientists in search of greater scientific credibility for adopting the assumptions of neo-classical economics. Above all, he stressed the social content of social science and its role in either sustaining or challenging relations of power. As a result, he strongly supported efforts to radically reform the discipline of political science, which included standing as a candidate in the 1977 election for president of the American Political Science Association on behalf of the Caucus for a New Political Science.

The restraint and modesty of Macpherson's style and approach tend to obscure the depth and power of his vision. Like the Frankfurt School, Macpherson operated within a specific conceptual and historical horizon shaped by the evolving contradictions and tensions of capitalism – and the crisis of classical

or orthodox Marxism. This crisis required a return to Marx's humanistic roots and a move away from the scientism of traditional socialism and communism. The theorist had to relate immediate political questions to the challenges facing humanity at a particular historical juncture. As a critical thinker with an historical focus, C.B. Macpherson remains our contemporary.

PHILLIP HANSEN

References

- Cunningham, Frank. 2019. *The Political Thought of C.B. Macpherson: Contemporary Applications*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hansen, Phillip. 2015. *Reconsidering C.B. Macpherson: From Possessive Individualism to Democratic Theory and Beyond*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Horkheimer, Max. 1973. "Traditional and Critical Theory." In *Critical Theory: Selected Essays*, translated by Matthew J. O'Connell and Others, 188–243. New York: The Seabury Press.
- Leiss, William. 2009. *C.B. Macpherson: Dilemmas of Liberalism and Socialism*. Second Edition. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Macpherson, C.B. 1976. "Humanist Democracy and Elusive Marxism: A Response to Minogue and Svacek." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* IX, no. 3 (September): 423–30.
- Macpherson, C.B. 2011. *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism: Hobbes to Locke*, with a New Introduction by Frank Cunningham. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press.
- Macpherson, C.B. 2012. *Democratic Theory: Essays in Retrieval*, with a New Introduction by Frank Cunningham. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press.
- Macpherson, C.B. 2012. *The Life and Times of Liberal Democracy*, with a New Introduction by Frank Cunningham. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press.
- Townshend, Jules. 2000. *C.B. Macpherson and the Problem of Liberal Democracy*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

See also

Critical Theory; Critique of Positivism and the Post-Behavioral Revolution; Democracy; Marxism; Post-Marxism; Socialism

197. Magdoff, Harry

Harry Magdoff (August 21, 1913–January 1, 2006) was an influential Marxist economist, who is best known for his work on U.S. imperialism, and as co-editor of the independent socialist magazine, *Monthly Review*. Magdoff grew up in the Bronx, New York as the child of Russian-Jewish immigrants. He first became interested in Marxism at the age of 15, when he read Karl Marx's *Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, which he considered a revelation for its explanation of historical development. After graduating high school, Magdoff studied at the City College of New York for three years (1930–33), but he was expelled for his campus political activities and for editing an unauthorized radical student magazine. He enrolled in New York University, where he earned a BSc. in Economics (1935). Magdoff held several government positions under Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal, including the Works Progress Administration, until he left government service in 1946 to become an advisor to Henry Wallace, the Progressive Party's 1948 U.S. Presidential candidate (D'Mello 2006; Foster 2006).

During the McCarthy era of the 1950s, Magdoff found that government employment was closed to him due to concerns that he was a national security risk. Magdoff provided testimony to Congressional committees and grand juries that he was being continually harassed for his political background, which drew the scrutiny of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. He was eventually black-listed and relocated to New York City to seek employment in business (Foster 2006). During the late 1950s and early 1960s, Magdoff caught the attention of a group of pro-New Deal businessmen and was hired to teach classes for a number of business firms. This led to an adjunct teaching position at the New School for Social Research and later at Yale University in a similar role. It was during this time that Magdoff developed a historical understanding of mainstream misconceptions about imperialism. While teaching courses on the economics of planning, economic development, the history of economic thought, the structure of U.S. business, imperialism, and Marxian economics, he came to view the development of capitalism as dependent on the use of imperi-

alist strategies in its endless search for profits (Foster 2006). Thus, Magdoff concluded that the elimination of imperialism would require "the overthrow of capitalism" (Foster 2002).

William K. Tabb (2006) observes that "Harry Magdoff has two specific things to teach us about imperialism. The first is the importance of historical contingency. The second is the usefulness of analytically separating stages of imperialism." Magdoff was highly critical of "the American Empire," and he challenged the dominant mainstream view that national security policy derived from the political aims of U.S. foreign policy. In 1969, Magdoff published *The Age of Imperialism*, where he argued that American imperial ambitions, and not anti-communism per se, led the United States into the Vietnam War. Moreover, he challenged the ideological claim that foreign economic activities were an "insignificant element in U.S. business interests" and showed that the flow of foreign direct investment abroad was generating significant revenue for U.S. multinational corporations. *The Age of Imperialism* was Magdoff's most influential book as it sold more than 100,000 copies and was translated into 15 languages. In this work, Magdoff (1969, 26) argued insistently that imperialism is inherent to capitalism: "Imperialism is not a matter of choice for a capitalist society," he wrote, "it is the way of life of such a society."

Magdoff identified a new form of imperialism in the contemporary period as one that rested on multinational corporations and three separate imperial conquests. The most obvious of these conquests was gaining control over as much of the sources of raw materials as possible (colonialism). The second conquest was the conquest of foreign markets with foreign direct investment becoming the most effective method of conquest (neocolonialism). The new industries, the new technology, and the rise of competition among industrialized nations gave a new importance to the control of raw materials (Magdoff 2003, 41). The rise of giant monopolistic firms is the central focus of Marxist theories of "new imperialism" or "Empire," which point to the changing global economic circumstances that emerged with the arrival of multinational or global corporations (Brewer 2012). As John Bellamy Foster explains, this was the new context "in which older phenomena, such as the extraction of surplus, the race for control of raw materi-

als and resources, the creation of economic dependencies in the global periphery and the unending competition among rival capitalist powers, manifested themselves in new and transformed ways" (Magdoff 2003, 14).

Magdoff's position as co-editor of *Monthly Review* gave him a public voice, which influenced and nurtured the New Left in America, especially during the late 1960s and 1970s. His influence continued into the 1980s, when Magdoff and Sweezy collaborated to produce a series of articles critical of the imperial role of the United States in the world economy and politics.

STACY MADDERN

References

- Brewer, Anthony. 2012. *Marxist Theories of Imperialism: A Critical Survey*. New York: Taylor and Francis.
- D'Mello, Bernard. 2006. "Harry Magdoff (1913–2006): '... There Can Be a Better World'." *Economic and Political Weekly* 41, no. 2 (January 14–20): 108–11.
- Foster, John Bellamy. 2006. "The Optimism of the Heart: Harry Magdoff (1913–2006)." *Monthly Review Online*. Available at <https://mronline.org/2006/01/02/the-optimism-of-the-heart-harry-magdoff-1913-2006/>.
- Foster, John Bellamy. 2002. "The Rediscovery of Imperialism." *Monthly Review* 54, no. 6. Available at <https://monthlyreview.org/2002/11/01/the-rediscovery-of-imperialism/>.
- Magdoff, Harry. 1969. *The Age of Imperialism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Tabb, William K. 2006. "Imperialism: In Tribute to Harry Magdoff." *Monthly Review* 58, no. 10 (March). Available at <http://monthlyreview.org/2007/03/01/imperialism-in-tribute-to-harry-magdoff>.

198. Marcuse, Herbert

Herbert Marcuse (1898–1979) was a political philosopher who, along with Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno, was a major theorist of the Institute for Social Research (The “Frankfurt School”) and its critical theory of society. Marcuse’s contributions to critical theory, his unwavering commitment to centering Marxism as a method of analysis, and his political activism in the New Left movement of the 1960s makes him a seminal figure in critical political science.

Marcuse was born in Berlin and received his Ph.D. at the University of Freiburg, where he later returned to work with Martin Heidegger. Marcuse planned on writing a habilitation (a post-doctoral qualification for a professorship in Germany), but this plan was abandoned in the face of an imminent Nazi takeover in 1932 (Marcuse 1987). Up until this point, Marcuse was invested in synthesizing existentialism and phenomenology with Marxist philosophy, because Marcuse saw potential in the immediacy of Heidegger’s philosophy to mediate the theory/praxis divide in useful ways for Marxist theory (Wolin 2001). Realizing his habilitation could never be completed, Marcuse was recommended by Edmund Husserl to join the Institute for Social Research. In anticipation of the rising Nazi threat, Marcuse was unable to join his colleagues in Frankfurt, and instead he was deployed to a branch office in Geneva, Switzerland (Marcuse 2001).

In 1934, Marcuse emigrated to the United States, where he joined the institute in its new home at Columbia University. There he contributed to the institute’s journal, *Studies in Philosophy and Social Science* (originally: *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung*), writing articles on a range of issues such as culture, technology, the rise of fascism, and philosophy. He was heavily involved in the work of the institute concerning the role of the proletariat as a revolutionary agent, and its apparent failure to meet its historical moment. In 1942, Marcuse joined the Office of War Information. Marcuse worked in the European Section of the Research and Analysis branch until 1951 (Neumann et al. 2013), during which time it was absorbed into the State Department. Marcuse took a leading role in denazification efforts,

though he lamented his advice often went unheeded (Marcuse et al. 1978).

After leaving the State Department, Marcuse worked at Columbia University and Harvard before taking up a permanent professorship at Brandeis in 1958. During this time, he published *Eros and Civilization* (1955), and *Soviet Marxism* (1958). The former is Marcuse’s attempt to synthesize Marx’s theory of alienation with Freud’s theory of libidinal repression to theorize a society that would be fundamentally different at the social, individual, and psychological level. *Eros and Civilization* was a forerunner to many of the countercultural values that would bloom in the 1960s. *Soviet Marxism* was a critique of Stalinism as antithetical to the aims of Marx’s theory, which he based in a methodology of immanent critique. In the same way that Marcuse critiqued advanced industrial society in post-war liberal societies, Marcuse subjected the ostensible Soviet alternative to its own goals and found the same problems of mechanized organization of industry seeping into everyday life, and domination by a technocratic elite. His theorizing maintains a focus on the conditions and possibilities for a qualitatively different society.

During the 1960s, against the general view that United States society was moving toward liberation, Marcuse struck a different chord. In 1964 he published his most widely read book, *One-dimensional Man*. This text made the case that the capitalist rationality of advanced industrial society subsumes formerly separate realms that might articulate alternative social relations, such as politics, culture, and discourse. The result is a one-dimensional society with a totalizing logic that subverts efforts at resistance, such as counterculture, and turns their effort into supporting the established order. Marcuse argues that a one-dimensional society will produce its own ersatz resistance to funnel dissatisfaction with the established order. Politics is reduced to periodic elections with pre-established parties, culture becomes a vector of consumer behavior, and language itself becomes a tool of reification for the current context. This is what Marcuse refers to as a “society without opposition” with a “smooth democratic unfreedom” (Marcuse 1964). The traditional working class is thus unable to fulfill its historical role as a revolutionary class because it is pacified with

a certain standard of living that the system provides. While this is a dire prognostication, for Marcuse domination is never complete; he also searches for who might be able to articulate alternative dimensions. He finds promise in the permanent underclass of people who one-dimensional society has spit out as unnecessary, both in advanced industrial society and in the global underclass of the so-called "third world." Marcuse sees such outcasts as a potentially politicized class that issues a "Great Refusal – the protest against that which is" (Marcuse 1964). This is the total negation of the existing order that Marcuse argues is more feasible when there are alternatives, or other dimensions.

The attention of *One-dimensional Man* catapulted Marcuse to international fame. Though he was uneasy with the title, he was often referred to as the "guru of the New Left." He was intimately involved in the student movement, and as such he advised many radical scholars, including Angela Y. Davis. Marcuse's involvement in the student movement is a prime example of his commitment to political activism to cultivate pockets of negativity that could put forth alternatives to the established order. Yet, even with the increased fame and grueling speaking schedule, Marcuse did not cease his scholarship asking what it would take to form a new society, or what kind of new people, with new sensibilities, would be able to achieve such a feat.

Marcuse also gained notoriety for his theory of "repressive tolerance." In the text *A Critique of Pure Tolerance*, Marcuse argued, in effect, that tolerance in a one-dimensional society is used as a blunt tool to marginalize dissenting voices and reify the existing order (Wolff et al. 1969). Tolerance is thus a tool of repression, and this lived reality precludes its liberal ideal. Marcuse argues that only a truly liberated society be tolerant, and in the meantime, the political struggle in the existing order is not to tolerate the intolerable, but to be inhospitable to the intolerable. This provides a theoretical grounding that justifies direct action against repression, as seen in various civil rights movements throughout the United States.

In the last part of his career, Marcuse continued exploring the prospects for a liberated, non-alienated society. His *Essay on*

Liberation (1969) and his final book, *The Aesthetic Dimension* (1978), reaffirmed the commitment to Marxism as a mode of analysis to dialectically engage the utopian demands for new societies with proper analytical tool to assess the totalizing force of one-dimensional life. Marcuse evinced a steadfast hopefulness that even in the face of the totalizing tendencies of advanced industrial society, it is still possible (and necessary) to negate the existing order and to demand a different, better world.

Herbert Marcuse died in Germany on July 29, 1979, at age 81. His ashes are buried in Berlin where his headstone, shaped like the number "one" has the simple, yet dialectical inscription: "weitermachen!" meaning both "keep going!" and "get on with it!" Marcuse's critical theory demands the same kind of unity of steadfastness in scholarship with the urgent need for activism.

ROBERT E. KIRSCH

References

- Marcuse, Herbert. 1955. *Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Marcuse, Herbert. 1964. *One-dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Marcuse, Herbert. 1969. *An Essay on Liberation*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Marcuse, Herbert. 1978. *The Aesthetic Dimension: Toward a Critique of Marxist Aesthetics*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Kellner, Douglas. 1985. *Herbert Marcuse and the Crisis of Marxism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Marcuse, Herbert, Jürgen Habermas, Heinz Lubasz, and Telman Spengler. 1978. "Theory and Politics: A Discussion." *Telos* 38: 124–53.
- Marcuse, Herbert. 1985. *Soviet Marxism: A Critical Analysis*. NY: Columbia University Press, reprint edition.
- Marcuse, Herbert. 1987. *Hegel's Ontology and the Theory of Historicity*, translated by Seyla Benhabib. Boston: MIT Press.
- Marcuse, Herbert. 2001. *Towards a Critical Theory of Society: Collected Papers of Herbert Marcuse, Volume 2*, edited by Douglas Kellner. New York: Routledge.
- Neumann, Franz, Herbert Marcuse, and Otto Kirchheimer. 2013. *Secret Reports on Nazi Germany: The Frankfurt School Contribution to the War Effort*, edited by Raffaele Laudani. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Wolff, Robert Paul, Barrington Moore, and Herbert Marcuse. 1969. *A Critique of Pure Tolerance*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Wolin, Richard. 2001. *Heidegger's Children: Hannah Arendt, Karl Löwith, Hans Jonas, and Herbert Marcuse*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

199. McConnell, Grant

Grant McConnell (b. June 27, 1915–d. September 27, 1993) was a distinguished political scientist who demonstrated that large parts of the American government are controlled by private interests, but at the same time he thought the presidency and political parties were not dominated by private interests. McConnell was born in Portland, Oregon and graduated from Reed College with a B.A. in 1937. He was a Rhodes Scholar (1938–39) at Oxford University, where he studied for a year with G.D.H. Cole, the renowned labor historian and theorist of guild socialism. In 1939, McConnell returned to the United States to study political science at Harvard University, where he was influenced by Alvin Hansen, a well-known Keynesian economist of that era.

McConnell left Harvard for Washington, D.C. to work as a writer for the Farm Security Administration (FSA), a New Deal agency meant to help small farmers. There, he witnessed the efforts by the American Farm Bureau Federation, the association for large farmers, to hobble and eventually abolish the FSA. This experience in effect became unanticipated participant-observer field work that led to his two most important books on how powerful private interests come to dominate the parts of government that are crucial for them to prosper.

In 1943 McConnell became a Naval officer specializing in sonar and radar, and he saw duty patrolling on a destroyer in the East China Sea. Following his military service, McConnell and his wife lived in a “partially built cabin” in a wilderness area in the state of Washington for three years, and usually returned there for summers and sabbatical leaves until they could no longer travel (Meister 1994, 286). He later played a role in the establishment of the North Cascades National Park, and during his retirement he wrote a memoir of his years there (McConnell 1988).

McConnell resumed his graduate work in political science in 1949 at the University of California, Berkeley, where he received his Ph.D. in Political Science (1951). His dissertation was published as *The Decline of Agrarian Democracy* (McConnell 1953). The book explains the way in which local chambers of commerce and well-off farmers

gradually created the working alliance in the post-Populist Era that led to the creation of the American Farm Bureau Federation, an organization that made it possible for Southern plantation owners, who were Democrats, to work closely with large-scale farmers outside the South, who were mostly Republicans, in taking control of the Department of Agriculture. The book also explains how the American Farm Bureau Federation wrote the revisions to the Agricultural Adjustment Act in 1938 so as to further limit the role of liberals and activists inside and outside the Department of Agriculture, who wanted to aid small farmers in general, and African American farmers in particular, as well as the vast armies of farm workers employed by the large farm interests. Subsequent archival research supported and added to McConnell’s account, including how the American Farm Bureau Federation eliminated the Farm Security Administration (Domhoff and Webber 2011, 187–95). Later research was able to show that the crucial domestic allotment provision in the original Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 was written through the joint efforts of the director of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fund and the Agricultural Committee of the Social Science Research Council, which at the time was an important foundation-funded think tank. The plan for domestic allotment payments, which made possible the vast government subsidies to agribusinesses that are still being paid today, were handed by the director of the Spelman Memorial Fund to two top leaders in the Chamber of Commerce and to the primary agricultural advisor to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who passed the plans along to the lawyers who drafted the legislation (Domhoff and Webber 2011, Chap. 4).

Upon receiving his Ph.D., McConnell worked as a faculty member at the University of California, Berkeley, but after teaching there for several years, McConnell moved to the University of Chicago in 1957, where he became Chair of the Political Science Department. While at Chicago, McConnell did the sustained work that led to his most important book, *Private Power and American Democracy* (1966). Contrary to the pluralist view that government mediates the conflicting views put forth by various interest groups, McConnell (1966, 162) concluded that there has been a “conquest of segments of formal state power by private groups and associa-

tions.” McConnell (1966, 339) had only one hesitation in concluding that “a substantial part of the government in the United States has come under the influence or control of narrowly based and largely autonomous elites,” arguing that they do not dominate the government in general because they “tend to pursue a policy of noninvolvement in the large issues of statesmanship, save where such issues touch their own particular concerns.”

This hesitation primarily concerned the existence of the Business Advisory Council (BAC), which he characterized as “one of the more remarkable groups ever associated with the government” (McConnell 1966, 276). After recounting its six confidential meetings a year with government officials, and mentioning the frequent reports on general issues it handed to government officials, McConnell (1966, 279) nevertheless concluded that the Business Advisory Council was not “a directorate of big business effectually controlling the economic policy of the nation,” because it included “a number of disparate elements,” including members of small businesses and also representatives of large businesses who had interests in conflict with each other.” However, archival research containing information not available when McConnell wrote, as well as correspondence among leaders in the BAC, determined that its leaders had a major role in creating and shaping the Social Security Act of 1935 (Domhoff 2020, Chap. 6–7). Several of these same leaders proposed the first version of the National Labor Relations Board, while serving as members of the business committee of the National Recovery Administration (McQuaid 1979). It was only after a liberal-labor coalition succeeded in strengthening the labor board through important provisions in the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, which soon led to big union advances, that the leaders of the BAC united strongly against it and challenged its constitutionality (Domhoff 2020, Chap. 2–3).

Subsequently, leaders of the Business Advisory Council created an in-depth policy discussion group consisting of corporate executives and expert economists in 1942, the Committee for Economic Development, which issued regular policy statements that were often adopted by government (Domhoff 2020, 148–9). In the late 1960s, leaders in the Business Advisory Council (by then renamed

the Business Council) and the Committee for Economic Development developed a new group – the Business Roundtable – that became more directly involved in lobbying the federal government. After their defeat on the National Labor Relations Act in 1935, the Business Advisory Council/Committee for Economic Development/Business Roundtable triumvirate seldom lost on a major policy issue (Domhoff 2022, 97–103).

McConnell (1966, 8) also rejected the idea of corporate domination because he claimed the “party system, the Presidency, and the national government as a whole represent opposing tendencies.” However, further historical research suggests that large plantations and new forms of agribusiness in the South joined with real estate interests and Machine Democrats in northern cities to control the Democratic Party into the 1980s, and that the northern corporate community controlled the Republican Party (Domhoff 2022, 137–42). In addition, a combination of interview and quantitative studies of voting patterns in Congress suggest that a conservative coalition, consisting at its core of a majority of Southern Democrats and a majority of Republicans voting together, controlled Congress on the issues that divide the United States by class (e.g., Manley 1973; Shelley 1983).

In 1969, after 11 years at the University of Chicago, McConnell moved to the University of California, Santa Cruz, where he was Chair of the Department of Politics until he retired in 1980. McConnell also played a role in establishing a new Environmental Studies program at Santa Cruz. Following his retirement in 1980, McConnell devoted most of his time to “activism and advocacy on environmental issues” (Meister 1994, 286). McConnell died on September 27, 1993, in the mountain hamlet of Bonny Doon, California, about five miles from the university campus.

G. WILLIAM DOMHOFF

References

- Domhoff, G. William. 2020. *The Corporate Rich and the Power Elite in the Twentieth Century: How They Won, Why Liberals and Labor Lost*. New York: Routledge.
- Domhoff, G. William. 2022. *Who Rules America? The Corporate Rich, White Nationalist*

- Republicans, and Inclusionary Democrats in the 2020s*. New York: Routledge.
- Domhoff, G. William and M.J. Webber. 2011. *Class and Power in the New Deal: Corporate Moderates, Southern Democrats, and the Liberal-Labor Coalition*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Manley, John F. 1973. "The Conservative Coalition in Congress." *American Behavioral Scientist* 17 (November/December): 223–47.
- McConnell, Grant. 1953. *The Decline of Agrarian Democracy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- McConnell, Grant. 1966. *Private Power and American Democracy*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- McConnell, Grant. 1988. *Stehekin: A Valley in Time*. Seattle: Mountaineers.
- McQuaid, Kim. 1979. "The Frustration of Corporate Revival in the Early New Deal." *Historian* 41, no. 4 (August): 682–704.
- Meister, Robert. 1994. "Grant McConnell: In Memoriam." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 27, no. 2 (June): 285–7.
- "Obituaries: Grant McConnell '37." *Reed Magazine*. Available at Grant McConnell 1937 | In Memoriam | Reed Magazine. Accessed April 8, 2023.
- Shelley, II, Mack C. 1983. *The Permanent Majority: The Conservative Coalition in the United States Congress*. University, AL: University of Alabama Press.

200. McCoy, Charles A.

Charles A. McCoy (1920–95) was born in Oak Park, Illinois and served in the Army Air Corps during World War II. Afterwards, he earned a B.A. in Education from Illinois State University (1948), an M.A. from Colgate University (1950), and a Ph.D. in Political Science from Boston University (1956). McCoy specialized in the comparative governments of Western Europe with an emphasis on the British Commonwealth and American national government. He was a founder of the Caucus for a Critical Political Science.

McCoy started his career as a research assistant in the Bureau of Public Administration at the University of Virginia joining the faculty of Temple University as an assistant professor (1956–68), where he rose to the rank of associate professor and department chair. McCoy left Temple to become chair of the Department of Government at Lehigh University (1968–76). He served as chair of the Political Science Department, and acting chair of the Sociology Department at the University of North Florida for one year (1976–77) before returning to Lehigh (1977–82) as a Full Professor. In 1982, McCoy moved to Australia, where he was a visiting research fellow at the University of Adelaide. He moved to Wellington, New Zealand, where he was associated with Victoria University. In 1989, he returned to Australia, where he was a visiting fellow at Queensland University of Technology. McCoy remained in Australia until his death on August 17, 1995.

In 1961–62, McCoy spent one year as a visiting lecturer at Leeds University in England. In 1966, he served as a professor at Monash University in Melbourne, Australia. McCoy (1963, 234) observed that in contrast to the American university, which had become an industrial factory of mass education, the “British university” was still a “community of scholars,” where a faculty member was “hired almost solely on the basis of his achievements or intellectual promise, not to meet the demands of students for instruction in a particular area of knowledge.” McCoy (1963, 235) found much to admire in the British university, partly because he classified himself “as a non-behaviorist,” who was “skeptical about how far one can pursue sci-

entific rigor in the social sciences and still deal with significant problems.” Yet, at the same time, his (1963, 235) experience with scholars in the British university system made him realize that he was nevertheless committed to an “empirical,” if non-behavioral, political science. He regarded “the British political scientist’s approach as too traditional” and “almost entirely preoccupied with the philosophic, legalistic, or descriptive treatment of political institutions.” McCoy later accepted a Fulbright lectureship at the University of Hong Kong in 1971.

McCoy published four books during his career beginning with a revised version of his dissertation, entitled *Polk and the Presidency* (1960). McCoy’s book broke new ground by arguing that President James K. Polk was the strongest U.S. President down to the Civil War. He marshalled an array of historical evidence to demonstrate that Polk had done more than any president before the Civil War to create a strong executive, as we know it today, based on Polk’s claim that the Presidency is uniquely representative of the nation and the people as compared to other branches of government. McCoy’s book on the Presidency became a staple among Presidential Studies scholars, which led to its republication in a second edition in 1973.

McCoy is most remembered among critical political scientists as the co-editor of *Apolitical Politics: A Critique of Behaviorialism* (1967), which served as an early manifesto of the “new political science” that led to the formation of the Caucus for a New Political Science in 1967. McCoy (1967, 10) argued that by the mid-1960s it would “not be unwarranted to speak of the behavioralists as members of an ‘establishment’ within the discipline.” The book appeared just prior to the actual founding of the CNPS, and its extensive critique of behaviorist methodology and pluralist theory became an intellectual rallying point for members of the CNPS. He followed up his foray into the “new political science” by publishing (with Alan Wolfe) a textbook on *Political Analysis: An Unorthodox Approach* (1972), which was part of a wide-ranging effort among critical political scientists to change the teaching of political science by providing new textbooks with alternative and critical perspectives.

McCoy was not just an intellectual inspiration to the Caucus for a New Political Science, but one of its organizational leaders.

He was elected Vice-President of the CNPS (1967–69). He ran for the APSA Council on the Caucus slate each year from 1972 to 1974. He was instrumental in successfully pushing for an amendment to the APSA Constitution in 1968 that “actively encourages in its membership and its journal research in and concern for significant contemporary political and social problems and policies, however controversial and subject to partisan discourse in the community at large these may be” (APSA 1968, 34).

In 2001, the Caucus for a Critical Political Science established the Charles A. McCoy Career Achievement Award in honor of his contribution to critical political science as both a scholar and a disciplinary activist.

CLYDE W. BARROW

References

- American Political Science Association. 1968. “Proposed Amendments to APSA Constitution.” *PS* 1, no. 3 (Summer): 34–5.
- Barrow Clyde W. 2017. “The Political and Intellectual Origins of New Political Science.” *New Political Science* 39, no. 4 (December 2017): 437–72.
- McCoy, Charles A. 1982. *Contemporary isms: A Political Economy Perspective*. New York: F. Watts.
- McCoy, Charles A. 1963. “Teaching Political Science at a British University.” *Improving College and University Teaching* 11, no. 4 (Autumn): 224–37.
- McCoy, Charles A. 1960. *Polk and the Presidency*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- McCoy, Charles A. and John Playford. Eds. 1967. *Apolitical Politics: A Critique of Behavioralism*. New York, NY: Thomas Y. Crowell.
- McCoy, Charles A. and Alan Wolfe. 1972. *Political Analysis: An Unorthodox Approach*. New York: Crowell.

See also

Critique of Positivism; Critique of Pluralism

201. Miliband, Ralph

Ralph Miliband (January 7, 1924–May 21, 1994) was one of the leading Marxists of the post-World War II period. He was a renowned scholar, teacher, and activist who, along with other noted intellectuals, defined the contours of the British New Left. Born in 1924 in Brussels to working class Polish Jewish immigrants, he fled Belgium on foot with his father in 1940, ahead of the invading Nazis, ending up in England. Only a few months after arriving in London, Miliband made a pilgrimage to Highgate Cemetery to visit the grave of Karl Marx, “swearing my own private oath that I would be faithful to the workers’ cause” (Panitch 1995, 4). He spent a lifetime keeping that pledge as an independent socialist, unaffiliated with the Communist Party or any other Left formation.

Miliband entered the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE), studying under his mentor, political theorist, and historian Harold Laski. With his education interrupted by a three-year stint in the Royal navy during World War II, Miliband returned to the LSE in 1946, working closely with Laski, who served as his Ph.D. thesis advisor. He taught sociology and politics at the LSE, the University of Leeds, and beginning in the late 1970s accepted a number of short-term appointments in North America at Brandeis University, York University in Toronto, and the City University of New York.

Miliband was a central figure in the intellectual ferment of the late 1950s emergence of the British New Left, leaving the Labour Party and thereafter critiquing its commitment to real socialist policies. In 1961 his first book, *Parliamentary Socialism*, was published and it gained wide notoriety as a trenchant historical study of the party since 1900 and the limitations of social democracy. His work with former communists such as E.P. Thompson, John Saville and other younger radicals, saw him involved in the stormy early years of *New Left Review*, leading to his founding in 1964, with Saville, of *The Socialist Register*, which he co-edited for 30 years. The critical space created by *New Left Review* and *The Socialist Register* proved a fertile ground for intellectuals and activists to debate the structure of advanced capitalism, the socialist project in opposition to that structure and myriad political, eco-

nomic, and social issues as viewed through the developing lens of Marxist theory.

In 1969 Miliband’s most influential book, *The State in Capitalist Society*, was published to wide acclaim and spirited debate. In this seminal work Miliband challenged *pluralism* as the dominant model of American Political Science. Far from the state acting as a neutral arbiter among conflicting interest groups, with power diffuse and fragmented, Miliband directed his empirical and historical acumen toward demonstrating that in western democracies the capitalist class dominates the state through its direct and indirect control of the state apparatus. Drawing on the pathbreaking examination of the American “power elite” by his close friend, sociologist C. Wright Mills – to whom he dedicated the book – Miliband chronicles the interpersonal relations between the capitalist class and state elites within governing institutions, ensuring that the state is used as an instrument of elite domination of public policy.

His focus on the background of people who occupy leadership roles in a cluster of state institutions led critics of Miliband, most notably Marxist political sociologist Nicos Poulantzas, to characterize his analysis as an “instrumentalist” theory of the state. Throughout the 1970s Poulantzas clashed with Miliband for allegedly reducing the state to a mere tool or instrument of ruling class dominance. As Poulantzas famously put it, “the direct participation of members of the capitalist class in the State apparatus and in the government, even where it exists, is not the important side of the matter. The relation between the bourgeois class and the State is an objective one” (Poulantzas 1973, 245). For Miliband’s opponents, the structure of the capitalist system necessitates the hegemony of the interests of business and finance. This instrumentalist-structuralist dichotomy over the state – what came to be known as the Miliband-Poulantzas debate – stands as one of the liveliest controversies on the Left. According to his defenders, Miliband’s opponents oversimplified or misrepresented his nuanced analysis, including his acknowledgment of the structural constraints pressuring state actors, such as the need to retain business confidence, and the efficacy of social movements that extract concessions from government leaders, over the opposition of elements of the capitalist class (Barrow 2008).

The controversy had cooled considerably by the time of Poulantzas's death in 1979, and Miliband turned his focus to moving beyond pluralist analyses to articulating a viable democratic socialist politics. His 1977 book *Marxism and Politics* and much of his later writings attempt to outline the contours of a socialist future, including the practical possibilities of "radical reformism" (Gude 2015; Panitch 2019). While social democratic, liberal, and conservative parties differ over means – sometimes with great consequence – they share the common end of maintaining "business confidence" for fear of dooming reform efforts. Miliband thus chronicled the rise of Thatcher's neoliberalism and the struggles of the Labour Party in the 1980s, challenging the belief of orthodox political science in the sufficiency of the party systems of western capitalist nations. He pressed for greater boldness and clarity in envisioning a truly democratic socialist society beyond the control of both communist and capitalist states.

WILLIAM F. GROVER

References

- Barrow, Clyde W. 2008. "Ralph Miliband and the Instrumentalist Theory of the State: The (Mis)Construction of an Analytic Concept." In *Class, Power and the State in Capitalist Society*, edited by Paul Wetherly, Clyde W. Barrow, and Peter Burnham, 84–108. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gude, Shawn. 2015. "The Other Miliband." *Jacobin*. July 17.
- Miliband, Ralph. 1961. *Parliamentary Socialism*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Miliband, Ralph. 1969. *The State in Capitalist Society*. New York: Basic Books.
- Miliband, Ralph. 1977. *Marxism and Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Panitch, Leo. 1995. "Ralph Miliband, Socialist Intellectual, 1924–1994." *The Socialist Register 1995*, Volume 31, edited by Leo Panitch, 1–21. London: Merlin Press.
- Panitch, Leo. 2019. "Ralph Miliband's Masterpiece at 50." *Jacobin*. June 16.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. 1973. "The Problem of the Capitalist State." In *Ideology in Social Science*, edited by Robin Blackburn, 239–53. New York: Vintage.

Further readings

- Barrow, Clyde W. 1993. *Critical Theories of the State: Marxist, Neo-Marxist, Post-Marxist*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Neuman, Michael. 2002. *Ralph Miliband and the Politics of the New Left*. London: Merlin Press.

See also

- Critique of Pluralism; Marxism; Theories of the State; Capitalist Class; Ruling Class; G. William Domhoff; C. Wright Mills; C. Leo Panitch; Nicos Poulantzas

202. Mills, C. Wright

C. Wright Mills (August 28, 1916–March 20, 1962) was a sociologist who spent most of his academic career at Columbia University. He was a leading public intellectual of the Cold War era who criticized the United States for its foreign policy, power relations, and transformation into a mass society. Mills held no party or ideological affiliation but was influenced by a Marxian analysis of political economy that made him tangentially socialist. His politics had strong strains of opposition to monopoly capitalism, militarism, and US imperialism.

Endowed with a principled and political sense of purpose, Mills's goal was to transform the U.S. into a more egalitarian democracy by diffusing its centralized power. He scorned post-World War II America for its political apathy, widespread conformity, rabid anti-communism, and unwavering belief in its own exceptionalism.

Mills produced his most creative work, from 1945 to 1960, during a time of Cold War tensions, nuclear proliferation, McCarthyism, de-Stalinization, bureaucratization, and self-alienation. Most disturbing for Mills was that the democratic values of reason and freedom were under threat due to citizens being politically complacent and civically disengaged. Thus, in the United States there was no true democracy through which critical ideas could be freely formed and expressed. Democratic freedom is realized only when individuals become aware of, and want to do something about, the social forces that constrain their lives.

Mills was the most successful sociologist of his time (and perhaps of all time) who published his political ideas in mass market paperbacks that were translated into several languages and sold in the hundreds of thousands of copies. He also contributed pieces to political and opinion magazines of the intellectual left such as *The New Leader* and *Partisan Review* as well as to popular media outlets like *The New York Times* and *Saturday Review*. In addition, he gave public talks before a variety of audiences including labor leaders, office managers, educators, army officers, Christian clergy, industrial designers, architects, and city planners.

Mills's works may be subsumed under three general categories. First, there is the

trilogy on class structure and power relations consisting of the volumes *The New Men of Power*, *White Collar*, and *The Power Elite*. In the latter Mills warned that as authority and influence became concentrated in corporate and government bureaucracies, there had arisen a national power elite that was ruling America and undermining its democracy. Second, there are his two paperback best-sellers that are the more politically inspired, and politically inspiring of his works. In *The Causes of World War Three* Mills sought to mobilize an international peace movement to oppose the nuclear arms race between the US and the USSR and take political action against the military industrial complex. In *Listen, Yankee: The Revolution in Cuba*, he presented the "voice" of the Cuban revolutionary to North American readers, particularly given that what was being told about the revolution in the United States was distorted by its mass culture and manipulated by its mass media. Finally, in his most famous book, *The Sociological Imagination*, Mills offered his vision of a publicly and politically engaged sociology.

Mills argued that liberalism, with its consolidation of political and military power, had become a conservative force in the capitalist societies, while in Soviet societies Marxism had hardened into a statist dogma. He exhorted intellectuals on both sides of the liberalism-Marxism ideological divide to practice a politics of responsibility and of truth; to be the critical voice that exposed the truth about political power relations. This was necessary to counter the higher immorality of the power elite in both the United States and the Soviet Union. It meant holding the ruling structures, whether corporations or central committees, accountable for their concentrated influence and irresponsible policies.

Mills advanced the notion that power relationships were involved in the interplay between "the culture of politics," on the one hand, and the "the politics of culture," on the other. For Mills, understanding the culture of politics – the scholastic, artistic, and scientific work that influenced political decisions – required an understanding of the politics of culture – the political decisions that influence cultural work.

Mills saw the intellectuals' main role to be agents of progressive social change. Due to the politics of culture, however, they had become politically irrelevant as their means

of production and communication, what Mills called the “cultural apparatus,” had been expropriated by monopolizing bureaucracies of economy and state. This meant that consumer capitalist society in the US did not possess a critically independent thinking class with access to truth.

During the early 1960s Mills came to be seen as a kind of spokesman for the New Left, the international movement of university student activists and young thinkers and dissident writers who were mobilizing for peace and civil rights. In his “Letter to the New Left,” which first appeared in the British journal *New Left Review*, Mills explained that to be of the “left” meant having political programs and strategies guided by reason, freedom, and justice. A left-wing politics required a political philosophy that considered structural realities as well as seeing the New Left as an agency of social global transformation.

A. JAVIER TREVIÑO

References

- Mills, C. Wright. 1948. *The New Men of Power*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1951. *White Collar*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1956. *The Power Elite*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1958. *The Causes of World War Three*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1959. *The Sociological Imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1960. *Listen Yankee: The Revolution in Cuba*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1960. “Letter to the New Left.” *New Left Review* 5 (Sept./Oct.): 18–23.

Further readings

- Geary, Daniel. 2009. *Radical Ambition: C. Wright Mills, the Left, and American Social Thought*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Mills, Kathryn with Pamela Mills, eds. 2002. *C. Wright Mills: Letters and Autobiographical Writings*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Treviño, A. Javier. 2021. *The Emerald Guide to C. Wright Mills*. Bingley, UK: Emerald.

See also

Marxism; Power Structure Analysis; Democracy; Ralph Miliband; G. William Domhoff

203. Mills, Charles W.

Charles W. Mills (1951–2021) was a Jamaica-raised political philosopher. A devoted bookworm from an early age, he spent his formative years exploring the library at the University of West Indies (Mona) in Kingston, where his father taught for over 30 years, and where he himself completed his B.A. in Physics (1971). In his activism and research, Mills was deeply influenced by growing up during the Jamaican independence movement and by experiencing the impact of neo-colonial rule alongside Britain's refusal to acknowledge it. Mills joined the revolutionary Worker's Party of Jamaica in the early 1970s, even while his family members held positions in government. Mills' love for Jamaica, including his love of Reggae music and Bob Marley, were constants throughout his life and career; he planned to join relatives on the island upon retirement, where he now rests on Shooter's Hill, a significant setting given its history of slave rebellion.

Mills obtained his M.A. (1976) and Ph.D. (1985) in Philosophy at the University of Toronto. After concluding his doctoral work, he became a distinguished Professor of Philosophy at The University of Oklahoma (1987–90), The University of Illinois at Chicago (1990–2007), Northwestern University (2007–16), and The Graduate Center, City University of New York (2016–21). Over the course of his career, Mills published over 100 articles and six books. (A seventh, *White Leviathan*, is in production.) Mills was honored by being an elected member of the American Academy of the Arts and Sciences and President (2017–18) of the Central Division of the American Philosophical Association (APA). He also gave prestigious named lectures, including the APA's John Dewey Lecture (2016), and the Tanner Lecture on Human Values (2020) at the University of Michigan.

In his early work, including in his dissertation, "The Concept of Ideology in the Thought of Marx and Engels," Mills contributed to mainstream Marxist thought. However, by the mid-1990s, Marxism was no longer his guiding philosophical framework as his analytic focus shifted squarely from class to race. By the 2000s, Mills had taken up the social contract tradition, and eventually

the Rawlsian apparatus, as the "mainstream" philosophical backdrop for his radical contributions. Even so, questions concerning how and why classed and raced people might work against their own material interests and the explanatory power of the Marxist concept of ideology remained central to his work throughout. Mills' (2007a) influential concept of "white ignorance," or the structural group-based mis-cognition that white supremacy fosters, is especially indebted to these Marxist origins.

His first and most influential work, *The Racial Contract* (1997), was "born of his awareness of the transnational predation still hobbling the political and economic sovereignty of Caribbean countries" (Alcoff 2023, 1). Mills argues that white supremacy is responsible for the way the world is today. More specifically, he argues that both theoretical and literal ideas of social contracting within mainstream political thought are grounded in historical contexts forged in and by conditions of domination and subordination. Mills denotes this formation of social order "the domination contract" (2007b); when the domination is race-based, such a domination contract is a "racial contract." Therefore, the Racial Contract builds into its framework an acknowledgement of the way by which moral and political status has been denied for most people, and how that exclusion created and justified today's global white supremacist state. The work won a 1997 Myers Outstanding Book Award from the Gustavus Myers Center for the Study of Bigotry and Human Rights in North America and was chosen by the 2000 Program Committee of the American Sociological Association as one of ten recent books "deemed to be important contributions to the discipline." The book was also nominated by Cornell University for the Pulitzer Prize and the National Book award.

Mills' *The Racial Contract*, along with Carol Pateman's (1988) *The Sexual Contract* (to which Mills' book is indebted) has transformed social contract theory, a central approach in political science and political philosophy. Social contract theorists can no longer naively endorse the definition of "contracting" as a cooperative venture for mutual advantage to explain and justify modern state formation (as Rawls' [1971] formulation does): social contracts as they exist are not

formed in a race- and gender-neutral way, by autonomous subjects making decisions.

But Mills' most important conceptual contributions, like those of group-based ignorance and racial contracting, do not merely engage with social contract theory, but also pervasively apply to everyday life. As his friends know, Mills was an avid consumer of pop culture, utilizing such engagement to keep up with the worldviews influencing his students. He engaged intensely with soul and R&B music, novels and comic books (especially science fiction), and watched hours of television, cultivating a decidedly modern sense of humor and wit; it was a practice that kept him rooted in the sensibilities of the moment. In his engagement with popular culture, Mills located and critiqued ubiquitous logics and practices at the heart of racially contracted social life. In his first posthumous article, published through the efforts of Mills' literary executor Chike Jeffers, Mills gives a devastating critique of J.R.R. Tolkien's *Lord of the Rings*, calling it "a literal transcription of ... the racist 'Aryan Myth'," which works to justify the genocidal tendencies of Europeans against non-whites and eventually themselves (2022, 107). As Jeffers sorts through the materials Mills left behind, we can expect further such commentary.

Mills did not just talk about the need to include women and philosophers of color in social institutions; he did it. He was a devoted teacher, particularly committed to introducing materials and themes that would be of interest to learners from less traditionally represented social groups. As a mentor, Mills was known to support these same students, going out of his way to create an encouraging environment. Charles is living proof that you can indeed change systems from within them. As one of his mentees, Emmalon Davis noted to me once in personal correspondence (September 2021): "Philosophy is more

hospitable, more attentive to issues of social oppression and injustice, and more colorful because of Charles Mills." I can imagine Mills replying, as he said to me once at an APA meeting: "Thank you for the kind remarks, but I'm really only here for the food."

TAYLOR ROGERS

References

- Alcoff, Linda. 2023. "The Roots (and Routes) of the Epistemology of Ignorance." In *The Racial Contract*, edited by Elvira Basevich. Special issue, *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*.
- Mills, Charles W. Forthcoming. *White Leviathan*.
- Mills, Charles W. 2022. "The Wretched of Middle-Earth: An Orkish Manifesto." *The Southern Journal of Philosophy* 60: 105–35.
- Mills, Charles W. 2007a. "White Ignorance." In *Race and Epistemologies of Resistance*, eds. Shannon Sullivan and Nancy Tuana, 13–38. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Mills, Charles, and Carol Pateman. 2007b. *Contract and Domination*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Mills, Charles W. 1997. *The Racial Contract*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Pateman, Carole. 1988. *The Sexual Contract*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Rawls, John. 2009. [1971]. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Further readings

- Mills, Charles W. 1994. "Non-Cartesian Sums: Philosophy and the African-American Experience." *Teaching Philosophy* 17, no. 3: 223–43.
- Sullivan, Shannon. 2017. "Smadditizin" Across the Years: Race and Class in the Work of Charles Mills." *Critical Philosophy of Race* 5, no. 1: 1–18.
- Westmoreland, Mark William, ed. (Forthcoming). *The Philosophy of Charles W. Mills: Race and the Relations of Power*. New York: Routledge (under contract).

204. Mouffe, Chantal

Chantal Mouffe is a political theorist and philosopher born in Charleroi, Belgium, on June 17, 1943. She studied philosophy in Leuven (1960–64) and later politics in Essex and Paris under Louis Althusser, while also engaging in second-wave feminism (Mouffe 2001, 10; Martin 2013, 1–2). She has visited numerous institutions, including Harvard, Cornell, and Princeton, and was program director at the Collège Internationale de Philosophie in Paris (1989–95). She belongs to the Essex school of Discourse Analysis with her coauthor and lifelong partner Ernesto Laclau, and was appointed at the University of Westminster since 2000, where she currently holds Emeritus status.

Her seminal opus with Laclau, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy* (1985) was developed as a theoretical project to tackle Marxism's critical shortcomings in accounting for the new social movements after 1968. It departed from a critical view of economic determinism and class essentialism, arguing that the demands of those new social movements were based instead on identity claims (Laclau and Mouffe 1985, 53; Thomassen 2016, 146). Mouffe has repeatedly indicated that their work sought “to articulate the struggles of the working class with those of the new social movements” (Hansen and Sonnichsen 2014, 264), to understand those complex identities and relationships among movements, and to identify a way for the left to collaborate with them (Martin 2013, 229).

Her theoretical production with Laclau thus sought to grasp how those identities were constructed and how they could be transformed. They turned to linguistics and discourse studies to retrace and reconstruct subject positions that were not unitary and coherent, but contingent and relational (Laclau and Mouffe 1985, 111–13). Their main argument centered on the need for leftist forces to seek the hegemonic articulation of demands based on those distinct group identities to enable mass movements that could counter neo-liberal hegemony (Laclau and Mouffe 1985, 4; Martin 2013, 213). Their proposed equivalence between class and other positions has earned their work the title of post-Marxist (Geras 1987; Mouzelis 1988).

Mouffe has continued to examine Gramsci's concept of hegemony and Schmitt's definition of political antagonism to critically deconstruct the notions of citizenship, pluralism, and representative democracy as present in liberal political theory (Mouffe 1979; Mouffe 2006) as well as in post-identitarian positions from the left, such as those of Hardt and Negri (Mouffe 2005). In *The Democratic Paradox* (2000) and *The Return of the Political* (2005), she developed the idea of radical democracy as the institutional space where those emancipatory struggles could be articulated.

The radical democratic project departs from the limitations in what Mouffe calls the aggregative and dialogic/deliberative models of democracy. Those models rest on a shared normative assumption of consensus-making as the central political tool available in democratic systems, but fail to explain some of the resulting democratic malaises (Mouffe 2005, 83), such as political disaffection, right-wing populism, or terrorism (Mouffe 2000, 4–5; Mouffe 2005, 64). Radical democracy, instead, accounts for conflict as the core of politics. Conflict is “constitutive of human societies” (Mouffe 2005, 9) because every political order “is based on some form of exclusion” (Mouffe 2005, 18). Following Carl Schmitt, Mouffe pleads for the need to acknowledge the “friend/enemy” differentiation as the primordial political act, an essential conflict that liberal democracies have limited capacity to absorb. However, unlike the German thinker, she refuses to reject pluralism on those grounds – and argues instead that the main task of democracy is to provide a channel to transform antagonisms into agonistic conflict.

While Schmitt's antagonism inevitably leads to the distinction between friends and enemies and the need to eliminate the latter, Mouffe's agonism is a relationship between adversaries. In democracies, antagonists share a symbolic space (Mouffe 2005, 30) and acknowledge the normative principles that shape their political community, but disagree on the interpretation of those principles. They struggle precisely to establish a dominant interpretation of those principles, but still recognize their adversary's right to existence; politics are therefore a “war of positions” aimed at transforming socioeconomic orders through an “internal process of rearticulation” of meaning (Hansen and

Sonnichsen 2014, 84). While genuine political pluralism must allow for confrontation between positions even if they are entirely incompatible with one another (Mouffe 2005, 24–5), the principles of equality and liberty for all create a substantial limit to political struggle: all antagonists must acknowledge everybody else's right to belonging and participation in the political arena (Mouffe 2000, 40).

The task for radical democracies is therefore to create the institutional conditions for antagonistic conflict to develop into adversarial, agonistic confrontation. In fact, "the aim of democracy is not consensus. The aim of democracy is to create the conditions for a conflictual consensus" (Hansen and Sonnichsen 2014, 266), not only in the local or national arena but also at the global level, to make possible a multipolar world "with a plurality of regional poles that organize their political and economic affairs in different ways" (Hansen and Sonnichsen 2014, 270).

Building on Marxist, Gramscian, and Schmittian approaches, Mouffe has contributed to critical political science by developing a theory of agonistic politics and radical democracy. Her more recent work further revindicates populism, examining how progressive movements, such as those of the left turn in Latin America, feminism, and new protest parties, have articulated their diverse struggles to mobilize mass support. The author actively advocates for this form of political strategy, labeling it as "left populism" – as in the case of *Podemos* in Spain (Errejón et al. 2016; Mouffe 2018). She maintains that "what we urgently need today is the development of left-wing populist parties able to give an institutional expression to the democratic demands of the numerous groups aspiring to an alternative to the current hegemony of neo-liberalism" (Martin 2013, 236).

MELISA ROSS

References

- Errejón, Íñigo, Chantal Mouffe, and Owen Jones. 2016. *Podemos: In the Name of the People*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Geras, Norman. 1987. "'Post-Marxism'?" *New Left Review* 163 (May/June): 40–82.
- Hansen, Allan Dreyer, and André Sonnichsen. 2014. "Radical Democracy, Agonism and the Limits of Pluralism: An Interview with Chantal Mouffe." *Distinktion: Scandinavian Journal of Social Theory* 15, no. 3: 263–70.
- Laclau, Ernesto, and Chantal Mouffe. 1985. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.
- Martin, James. 2013. *Chantal Mouffe*. London: Routledge.
- Mouffe, Chantal. 2000. *The Democratic Paradox*. London: Verso.
- Mouffe, Chantal. 2001. "Democracy – Radical and Plural." *CSD Bulletin* 9: 10–14.
- Mouffe, Chantal. 2005. *The Return of the Political*. London: Verso.
- Mouffe, Chantal. 2006. "Articulated Power Relations: Markus Miessen in Conversation with Chantal Mouffe." Centre for Research Architecture. London: Goldsmiths College, University of London.
- Mouffe, Chantal. 2018. *For a Left Populism*. London: Verso.
- Mouzelis, Nicos. 1988. "Marxism or post-Marxism?" *New Left Review* 167 (1): 107–23.
- Thomassen, Lasse. 2016. "Hegemony, Populism and Democracy: Laclau and Mouffe Today." *Revista Española de Ciencia Política* 40 (March 2016): 161–76.

Further readings

- Marchart, Oliver. 2007. *Post-foundational Political Thought: Political Difference in Nancy, Lefort, Badiou and Laclau*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Smith, Anna Marie. 1998. *Laclau and Mouffe: The Radical Democratic Imaginary*. London: Routledge.
- Tambakaki, Paulina, ed. 2014. *Chantal Mouffe: Agonism and the Politics of Passion*. Special Issue. *Parallax* 20, no. 2.

205. Newton, Huey P.

Dr. Huey Percy Newton (1942–89) was a spouse, father, brother, friend, political activist, author, organizational leader, intellectual, and survivor. Mostly credited for co-founding the Black Panther Party in October 1966, Newton's influence and legacy extend well beyond this feat and demonstrates the transformative potential that humans possess when confronted by social impediments.

Huey P. Newton was born to Armelia Johnson (homemaker) and Walter Newton (laborer and Baptist preacher) in Monroe, Louisiana on February 17, 1942. Together, the couple birthed and raised seven children with Huey being the youngest. Despite the socio-economic barriers that afflicted many Black people across the country, his parents instilled in their children the necessity to be courageous, strong, and un-afraid of people (Marine 1969). In 1944, Huey's father decided to migrate to Oakland, California in search of better opportunities for his family. He eventually secured a position at the Naval Supply Depot. By April 1945, Walter Newton established a foundation that enabled him to move the remainder of his family to Oakland. Once in Oakland, the Newtons moved constantly across the city, but eventually, settled in a home on 47th Street (Marine 1969).

Throughout his early schooling to high school graduation in 1959, Huey realized that U.S. education was a microcosm of the tension between many Blacks and the U.S. government. Based on years of failed promises and abuse, it was logical for someone like Huey to conclude that the United States' primary aims were to dismantle, disrupt, and destroy any remnant of Black humanity. This rancor against Black people trickled into the education system, which functioned to suppress many youths' intellectual growth. Under this system, Huey was classified as "borderline mentally disabled" (based on IQ scores) and a "functional" illiterate (Marine 1969). However, rather than succumbing to these labels, Huey began to self-educate – a decision that enabled him to improve in reading and writing. Thus, by constantly studying and reading complex works, Huey's quest for knowledge grew and compelled him to attend Merritt College where he studied politics (Marine 1969).

While working to attain his Associate of Arts degree from Merritt, Huey became active with politics and campus organizations. His appetite for knowledge expanded to works by many revolutionary and decolonial figures such as Malcolm X and Frantz Fanon. In 1962, Huey joined the Afro-American Association (AAA). As a member of the AAA, Huey saw the potential of a social movement and, together, they were instrumental in introducing the first Black history course to Merritt's curriculum. During fall 1962, Huey was speaking at a campus rally and was approached by Bobby Seale who was impressed with his speech. Seale would soon join the AAA and participate in their various campus activities. By 1964, Huey's ideology began to diverge from the AAA as he migrated towards revolutionary politics and social consciousness (Marine 1969). In 1966, Newton and Seale's ideologies and bond continued to grow, but by October, they realized that they needed to form a group that would take a more revolutionary nationalist and anti-capitalistic approach to better serve the community. Responsively, they birthed the Black Panther Party for Self-Defense on October 15, 1966.

As the pair crafted the framework of the organization, they conceptualized a Ten-Point Program and Platform – a list of demands that called for an immediate end to the social, economic, and political abuses experienced by Blacks in the U.S. With the flip of a coin, Huey became the Minister of Defense and Bobby became the Chairman. Soon, the dyad began to recruit people from the community. As the group developed, they decided to remove "for self-defense" from their name to prevent people from diverting attention away from their intended purpose of improving the plight of Black people (Jeffries 2002; Marine 1969).

Over the course of 16 years, the Black Panther Party worked with communities, locally and globally, to institute 65 community survival programs to meet their basic needs (C-Span 2006). Although commendable and necessary, the Panthers' efforts were not received positively by various law enforcement and governmental officials. In a quest to cripple the organization, the Federal Bureau of Investigation enacted the most sophisticated acts of violence to decimate the organization and the lives of its members by way of their Counter-Intelligence Program

(COINTELPRO) (Jeffries 2002; Churchill and Vander Wall 1990). This blatant disregard for human life laid truth to the oppressive nature of the country, and further reinforced Huey's plea that the United States was in dire need of overhaul. Huey would later document the government's repressive actions orchestrated against him and the Black Panther Party in his dissertation (and later book) (Newton 1996).

The life and experience of Huey P. Newton is a unique story that underscores the potential strength that a counterforce can have against oppression. Despite being a victim of the United States' education and penal systems, Huey was able to emerge as one of the greatest minds who courageously linked the theories and perspective of the past and applied it to transform the social conditions of historically oppressed groups, globally (Newton 1973). In his development and introduction of Intercommunalism, Newton believed that power was fluid and in constant transformation (Rodriguez 2006; Black Panther Party Newspaper 1971). For Newton, it was imperative that *all* oppressed people establish communities across the globe to prevent the spread of global capitalism before further harm was inflicted upon them. In 1980, he attained a Ph.D. in History of Consciousness from the University of California at Santa Cruz. It was here that Dr. Newton met Dr. Robert Trivers, an evolutionary biologist, and the two partnered to examine the cost of self-deception on human behavior (Trivers 2002). Despite Huey's passing on August 22, 1989, his life, ideals, and legacy continue to be preserved at the Huey P. Newton Foundation by its president, Ms. Fredrika Newton (Huey's widow), in Oakland, California. Through the Foundation, the lessons that Dr. Newton taught during his life will continue to educate

and prepare people to seize their liberation. All Power to the People!

OMARI L. DYSON

References

- [author unknown]. 1971. "Educate to Liberate." *Black Panther Newspaper*, March 27.
- Churchill, Ward, and Jim Vander Wall. 1990. *Agents of Repression: The FBI's Secret Wars Against the Black Panther Party and the American Indian Movement*. Boston: South End Press.
- Jeffries, Judson L. 2002. *Huey P. Newton, The Radical Theorist*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.
- Marine, Gene. 1969. *The Black Panthers*. New York: New American Library.
- Newton, Huey P. 1973. *Revolutionary Suicide*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
- Newton, Huey P. 1996. *War Against the Panthers: A Study of Repression in America*. New York: Harlem River Press.
- C-Span. *Origins of the Black Panther Party*. 2006. www.c-span.org/video/?1913541/origins-black-panther-party.
- Powers, Richard G. 1987. *Secrecy and Power: The Life of J. Edgar Hoover*. New York: The Free Press.
- Rodriguez, Besenia. 2006. "Long Live Third World Unity! Long Live Internationalism": Huey P. Newton's Revolutionary Intercommunalism. *Souls*, 8, no. 3: 119-41.
- Summers, Anthony. 1993. *Official and Confidential: The Secret Life of J. Edgar Hoover*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons Publishers.
- Trivers, Robert. 2002. *Natural Selection and Social Theory: Selected Papers of Robert Trivers*. New York: Oxford University Press.

See also

Critical Race Theory; Stokely Carmichael; Black Marxism

206. Nkrumah, Kwame

Kwame Nkrumah was born September 21, 1909 and died April 27, 1972. Between 1951 and 1966, Kwame Nkrumah was the first prime minister of the West African country of Ghana and, after 1960, he served as president. Nkrumah was born in the far southwestern Gold Coast (contemporary Ghana) town of Nkroful, although his life crossed numerous political, social, and geographic boundaries. During his early life, he was among the first generation of Gold Coast youth to attend school in comparatively large numbers. He was also part of one of the first graduating classes at the prestigious Prince of Wales College and School – now Achimota School – just outside the Gold Coast capital of Accra in 1930. Achimota would develop into one of West Africa's premier secondary schools.

In 1935, Nkrumah traveled to the United States to attend Lincoln University, a historically black college, where he completed a bachelor's degree in economics and sociology (1939). He taught at Lincoln University and later earned an M.A. in Philosophy and an M.S. in Education at the University of Pennsylvania (1943). Nkrumah spent ten years in the United States exploring African-American and diasporic culture and politics, attending Black churches, and engaging with organizations such as Paul Robeson's Council on African Affairs and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. In 1945, Nkrumah traveled to Great Britain, where under the tutelage of the Trinidadian pan-Africanist George Padmore, he helped organize the Fifth Pan-African Conference in Manchester. He was also a founding member and general secretary of the West African National Secretariat, which aimed to build upon the anticolonial message of the Manchester Pan-African Conference with a vision for a united and socialist West Africa.

Nkrumah returned to the Gold Coast in December 1947. Invited by fellow Lincoln University alum Ako Adjei to serve as the general secretary of the United Gold Coast Convention (UGCC), ostensibly headed by the prominent Gold Coast nationalist J. B. Danquah, Nkrumah quickly began a campaign of political organization throughout the Gold Coast that, for him, centered on the need for African self-government.

Eventually breaking with the UGCC over the question of the speed by which to pursue self-government, Nkrumah established his own party, the Convention People's Party (CPP), in June 1949. The CPP stands out in African political history as one of Africa's first mass parties. Nkrumah and the CPP would dominate the Gold Coast's first popularly contested elections in 1951 and would win subsequent general elections in 1954 and 1956 before leading Ghana to its March 1957 independence.

At independence, Nkrumah would commit the new Ghana to the pursuit of African liberation and unity. In the ensuing years, this commitment helped transform Ghana into one of the key sites of African anticolonialism and pan-Africanism in the world, drawing a range of activists and freedom fighters to the new state, including W. E. B. Du Bois, Shirley Graham Du Bois, Maya Angelou, Frantz Fanon, and Robert Mugabe, among others. As prime minister/president, Nkrumah largely followed a socialist development policy, while also positioning Ghana as a prominent actor in the growing Non-Aligned Movement. At home, Nkrumah and his CPP government had increasingly begun to distance itself from the country's adopted multi-party democracy by the early 1960s. A 1964 referendum would officially transform the country into a one-party state. Two years later, while en route on a diplomatic visit to North Vietnam, segments of the Ghanaian military and police would overthrow Nkrumah. He would die in exile in the West African country of Guinea on April 27, 1972.

Nkrumah has a wide-ranging political and intellectual legacy. As exemplified through his commitment to African liberation and pan-Africanism during his political career, he is often credited for popularizing a conception of African decolonization that eschewed the presumed inevitability of the postcolonial nation-state. Taking different shapes at varying times in his career, Nkrumah broadly promoted an idea of decolonization centered on a roughly defined "United States of Africa." Inside Ghana, this commitment to pan-Africanism similarly led to a conception of Ghanaian citizenship that loosely became defined through ideals of pan-Africanism, socialism, and political and civic discipline. Relatedly, through the publication of such books as *Africa Must Unite*

(1963) and *Neo-colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism* (1965), he emerged as one of the foremost political theorists in Africa on the threats posed by what he described as Africa's postcolonial balkanization and what he presented as the new face of imperialism – neocolonialism.

JEFFREY S. AHLMAN

References

- Nkrumah, Kwame. 1963. *Africa Must Unite*. London: Panaf.
 Nkrumah, Kwame. 1965. *Neo-Colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism*. New York: International Publishers.

Further readings

- Ahlman, Jeffrey. 2021. *Kwame Nkrumah: Visions of Liberation*. Athens: Ohio University Press.
 Ahlman, Jeffrey. 2017. *Living with Nkrumahism: Nation, State, and Pan-Africanism in Ghana*. Athens: Ohio University Press.
 Gaines, Kevin K. 2006. *American Africans in Ghana: Black Expatriates and the Civil Rights Era*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

See also

- Colonialism; Decolonization; Du Bois, W.E.B.; Fanon, Frantz; Neo-colonialism; Socialism

207. O'Connor, James

James O'Connor (April 20, 1930–November 12, 2017) was a political economist at the University of California Santa Cruz. He earned a Ph.D. in Sociology at Columbia University and was a member of the sociology faculties at Washington University in St. Louis and San Jose State University before he was hired in the mid-1970s to join the Department of Sociology at the University of California, Santa Cruz (UCSC). After retiring from UCSC, O'Connor co-founded and served as Editor-in-Chief for the journal *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism: A Journal of Socialist Ecology*, and he directed the Center for Political Ecology in Santa Cruz.

O'Connor is best known as the author of *The Fiscal Crisis of the State* (1973, 2002), where he attends to the study of public finance by drawing on insights derived from Paul Baran and Paul Sweezy's *Monopoly Capital* (1966). The contrast between orthodox economics' lack of a theory of the state budget and Baran and Sweezy's treatment of state expenditures as "surplus" led O'Connor to develop a more sophisticated Marxist analysis that recognized the contradictory nature of much state spending. The book's publication coincided with the end of the post-1945 economic boom, which had been financed by an explosion of public debt that eventually would have to be repaid amid mounting industrial and social unrest. These factors presaged an intensification of political conflict given the contemporaneous protests in the U.S. against the war in Vietnam and institutionalized racism, alongside an increasingly militant labor movement in the industrialized West more generally.

O'Connor's key insight was that the capitalist state must both facilitate and legitimate the capital accumulation process. These vital functions are not necessarily compatible and therefore often clash with each other. Downward redistribution, for example, may shield the most vulnerable sections of the population from the unpleasant effects of "market forces," (legitimation) but capitalists and allied class fractions are likely to chafe at the loss of earnings through the higher taxes required to fund such spending. Nevertheless, under certain circumstances, the inadequacy of state social provision may undermine the legitimacy of the economic

system. As a result, capitalists and their allies engage in ideological struggle to undermine the legitimacy of redistribution against the corresponding justifications of its advocates.

The state's contribution to the accumulation process was further elaborated in O'Connor's classification of state expenditures as either investment in social capital or as social expenses (i.e., costs with no economic return on social investment). Again, the delineation of these categories was rarely mutually exclusive in practice. Military expenditure, regarded as wasteful by Baran and Sweezy, can be treated as a social expense, but its associated research and development expenditures often yields technologies and products with profit-making civilian applications, such as passenger aircraft and satellite navigation systems. All of this underscores the tendency of the state to grow in size, as it attempts to manage these and other contradictions that would otherwise threaten the stability of the capital accumulation process.

O'Connor was a member of the collective that founded the influential journal *Kapitalistate*, which ran from 1973–83, specializing as a forum for research in Marxist state theory. However, the journal's demise seemed to coincide with the end of a particularly fruitful period of theoretical development and debate within Marxism regarding the state, and with O'Connor's own shift toward wider concerns encompassing capitalist social reproduction, culminating in his book, *Accumulation Crisis* (1984). In this work, O'Connor employed the Gramscian (and by extension Althusserian) concept of ideological hegemony as materially embedded in social practices that adapt to but also shape the adaptation of new regimes of accumulation as older ones decline. Without this adaptation of social practices, they become social barriers to accumulation. Nevertheless, due to their deeply rooted continuities within those spaces where they are materially embedded, the new regimes must themselves adhere to limits imposed by such social practices lest they fail to accomplish their task of stable accumulation. In this respect O'Connor's work shares important characteristics with the the Social Structures of Accumulation school of Marxist political economy, despite being independent of it (McDonough 2008).

Given his growing attention to the conditions of production and social barriers to accumulation, it was logical that O'Connor's next and ultimately final significant focus would result from growing awareness of the global ecological crisis. To that end, and together with Barbara Laurence, O'Connor established the journal *Capitalism Nature Socialism* in 1988. The first issue contained his article on "The Second Contradiction of Capitalism," which he later revised and expanded for inclusion in the collection *Natural Causes* (O'Connor 1998). While the first contradiction concerns capital's tendency to overproduction, exacerbated when capital exercises greater power over labor, the second contradiction arises from capitalism's privatization of profits alongside its socialization of costs and risks – a pathology highlighted earlier in *The Fiscal Crisis of the State*. The manifestation of the second contradiction typically involves economically destructive appropriation of labor power, infrastructure, and natural resources. While individual capitals seek to lower their costs by externalizing them, this has the effect of raising aggregate costs and thereby those incurred by capital as a whole. On this point, O'Connor acknowledges his debt to Karl Polanyi, whose *The Great Transformation* (1944) highlighted how capitalist market relations are destructive of the social and environmental conditions upon which such relations depend. Applying this insight to capitalism's exploitation of labor power and the environment enabled O'Connor to extend it to its undermining of its own conditions of production.

The second contradiction of capitalism ignited controversy within Marxist circles, especially the Monopoly Capital school as represented by John Bellamy Foster, whose

own *Marx's Ecology* (2000) criticized O'Connor's treatment of Marx as having an underdeveloped theory of ecological crisis leading to economic crisis. Foster's work was in its turn rejected comprehensively in the pages of a special edition of *Capitalism Nature Socialism* in 2001. Other critics, including the Spanish economist Joan Martinez Alier, with whom O'Connor worked extensively, argued that it would have been more accurate to expand the second contradiction to encompass the conditions of livelihood or existence – reproduction – rather than simply production. More recently, Nancy Fraser has been among those arguing that while Foster's criticisms are valid, the concept of a second contradiction "remains a major touchstone" (Fraser 2021, 101 n4) in the development of a Marxist ecology. This judgment applies to O'Connor's work more generally.

MICHAEL KEANEY

References

- Foster, John Bellamy. 2000. *Marx's Ecology: Materialism and Nature*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Fraser, Nancy. (2021) "Climates of Capital: For a Trans-environmental Eco-socialism." *New Left Review* 127 (January/February): 94–127.
- McDonough, Terrence. 2008. "Social Structures of Accumulation Theory: The State of the Arts." *Review of Radical Political Economics* 40, no. 2: 153–73.
- O'Connor, James. 1984. *Accumulation Crisis*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- O'Connor, James. 1998. *Natural Causes: Essays in Ecological Marxism*. New York: Guilford Press.
- O'Connor, James. 2002 [1973]. *The Fiscal Crisis of the State*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Polanyi, Karl. 1944. *The Great Transformation*. New York: Farrar and Rinehart.

208. Ollman, Bertell

Bertell Ollman (b. April 30, 1935 in Milwaukee) is professor emeritus of politics at New York University and a prominent figure in the U.S. academic left. Ollman received a B.A. (1956) and M.A. (1957) in political science from the University of Wisconsin at Madison. He left Wisconsin for Oxford University in England, where he earned a B.A. in Philosophy, Politics, and Economics (1959), an M.A. in Political Theory (1963), and a Ph. D. in Political Theory (1967). He immediately began teaching at New York University in 1967, where he spent his entire career. Ollman was also a prominent member of the Caucus for a New (Critical) Political Science, the American Political Science Association, and the Radical Philosophy Association.

Ollman was at the forefront of the rise of academic Marxism in U.S. political science during the 1970s and 1980s (Kesselman 1982). He was catapulted to academic prominence by his first book *Alienation: Marx's Conception of Man in Capitalist Society* (1971), which was published by the prestigious Cambridge University Press. Sales of the book were so robust that it was reprinted three times (1972, 1973, 1975) and then released in a second edition (1976), which was reprinted two more times (1977, 1978). Ollman's *Alienation* was widely and favorably reviewed and in a variety of scholarly publications. *Alienation* was immediately recognized as a major contribution to the development of "humanist Marxism" in Western political theory, which anchored Marxism in Marx's early philosophical writings, such as *The Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844* as opposed to his later economic writings, such as *Das Kapital* (Seigel 1973). Ollman's book offered a sweeping reinterpretation of Marx that repudiated "more reductionist interpretations of Marx" often prevalent at the time (Rader 1973). One reviewer observed that Ollman's *Alienation* was not just an "important contribution" to understanding Marx, but "a rereading of the entire Marxian corpus from the viewpoint of alienation taken to be the core concept of Marx's thought at every stage of its development" (T.R.F. 1972). The dialectical method of totality and internal relations developed in the book emerged as a major theoretical

counterpoint to the dominance of the structuralist Marxism of Louis Althusser, which was ascendant among Anglo-American Marxists (Ollman 1973, 1993, 2003). Ollman further secured his reputation with the publication of *Social and Sexual Revolution: Essays on Marx and Reich* (1978) and *Studies in Socialist Pedagogy* (1978), co-edited with Theodore Mills Norton.

Ollman was frequently at the center of political controversy. He ran twice (1976, 1977) for the APSA Council as a candidate of the Caucus for a New Political Science. In 1978, Ollman was one of the architects of a so-called "socialist takeover" of the CNPS at its September 1978 business meeting in New York City. John Rensenbrink (1982) described the young radicals, who included Ollman, as a coalition of Marxist humanists, feminist socialists, decentralist ecologists, and participatory democrats. The 1978 socialist takeover marked a decisive shift in leadership and direction away from an older generation of liberals to a younger generation of radicals, who left a permanent imprint on the organization. The same year Ollman was the CNPS candidate for President of the American Political Science Association and he accurately declared that he was proposing "the most radical program statement of any of those offered by the other Caucus candidates who ran for this office." Ollman won 28.4 percent of the vote for APSA President.

On March 3, 1978, University of Maryland College Park Provost Murray Polokoff made a telephone call to Bertell Ollman (2002, 46) to offer him the position of Chairman of the Department of Government and Politics "subject to the approval of the president." However, on July 20, 1978, newly appointed President John S. Toll (1981, 17) announced to the University of Maryland Board of Regents that "I have decided after consultation and review concerning this case, *not* to approve the appointment." Toll's veto of the Ollman appointment occurred after a controversy erupted regarding Ollman's Marxism. It was alleged that undue political pressure had been exerted on the new president to overturn Ollman's appointment by members of the board of regents, the Acting Governor, powerful state legislators, and conservative media pundits.

Indeed, conservative pundits Rowland Evans, Jr. and Robert Novak (1978) had published a column in *The Washington*

Post entitled “The Marxist Professor’s Intentions,” where they sounded the alarm about “the appointment of a Marxist to head the University of Maryland’s department of government and politics.” Evans and Novack agreed that it would be wrong “to oppose Ollman simply for his Marxist philosophy,” but they went on to suggest that the central question was “not Ollman’s beliefs, but his intentions.” His intentions, according to Evans and Novack (1978), were “to use the classroom as an instrument for preparing what he calls ‘the revolution’.” Evans and Novack argued that Ollman was not a “philosophical Marxist” to be tolerated under the doctrine of academic freedom, but “an outspoken proponent of ‘political Marxism’,” which was “a form of indoctrination that could transform the real function of a university and transcend limits of academic freedom.” The evidence of Ollman’s intent were statements made during his two campaigns for the APSA Council as a candidate of the Caucus for a New Political Science, where he promised that, if elected, “I shall use every means at my disposal to promote the study of Marxism and Marxist approaches to politics throughout the profession.” The case resulted in two lawsuits – Ollman lost both of them – but the University of Maryland was censured by the American Association of University Professors for violating its statements on academic freedom and university governance. Since *Ollman v. Evans* concluded in 1985 it has been referenced at least 536 times in law reviews and periodicals, but it has received almost no attention from political scientists (LexisNexis 2022).

During this time (1978–83), Ollman garnered additional worldwide attention as the inventor of a new board game called *Class Struggle*. The game was based on Marxist theory, and players acted as different classes – capitalists, intellectuals, petit-bourgeois, farmers, and others – but it was structured so that the capitalist class nearly always won the game. Ollman began his own company to produce and market the game, but he later licensed rights to the game to Avalon Hill, a major game company with established production and distribution capabilities. Ollman recounted the trials and tribulations of being a small business owner in his book *Ball Buster? True Confessions of a Marxist Businessman* (2002).

Following his foray into political and legal controversy, as well as a failed business venture, he returned to more academic matters by engaging the debate over “market socialism,” which was gaining currency as an idea among Western Marxists after the fall of the Soviet Union. In contrast to many on the left, Ollman remained steadfast in his opposition to markets, which he identified as the economic basis of commodity fetishism and alienation and, thus, a detriment to human well-being regardless of the mode of production. He edited a book on *Market Socialism* (1998), which was republished in Chinese in 2000.

In 2009, Ollman was again in the media spotlight when he was interviewed on FOX News by Sean Hannity, a former student of his at N.Y.U. While describing Ollman as a “renowned Communist,” Hannity claimed on national television that Ollman’s grading was biased against conservatives because Ollman’s course was allegedly the only course Hannity took at NYU where he received less than “A.” While Ollman defended his teaching methods, and pointed out that non-Marxist students do at least as well as Marxist and radical students, Ollman (2009) replied nevertheless that if he had known then what he knew now about Hannity he would have failed him instead of giving him a “C+.”

In 2001, Ollman won the first Charles A. McCoy Career Achievement Award from the New Political Science section of the American Political Science Association.

CLYDE W. BARROW

References

- Evans, Jr., Rowland and Robert Novak. 1978. “The Marxist Professor’s Intentions.” *Washington Post*, May 4. Available at www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/1978/05/04/the-marxist-professors-intentions/5e267381-f317-4124-afb8-515ea59dd3bc/.
- Kesselman, Mark. 1982. “The State and Class Struggle: Trends in Marxist Political Science.” In *The Left Academy: Marxist Scholarship on American Campuses*, edited by Bertell Ollman and Edward Vernoff, 82–114. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- LexisNexis. 2022. “Report of *Ollman vs. Evans* 750 F.2d 970, App. D.C. 301, 1984.”
- Norton, Theodore Mills and Bertell Ollman, eds. 1978. *Studies in Socialist Pedagogy*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

- Ollman, Bertell. 1973. "Marxism and Political Science: Prolegomenon to a Debate on Marx's Method." *Politics & Society* 4, no. 3: 491–510.
- Ollman, Bertell. 1976 [1971]. *Alienation: Marx's Conception of Man in Capitalist Society*, 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ollman, Bertell. 1978. Ollman, *Social and Sexual Revolution: Essays on Marx and Reich*. Montreal: Black Rose Press.
- Ollman, Bertell. 1993. *Dialectical Investigations*. New York: Routledge.
- Ollman, Bertell. 1998. *Market Socialism: The Debate Among Socialists*. New York: Routledge.
- Ollman, Bertell. 2002. *BallBuster? True Confessions of a Marxist Businessman*. Brooklyn, N.Y.: Soft Skull Press.
- Ollman, Bertell. 2003. *Dance of the Dialectic: Steps in Marx's Method*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Ollman, Bertell. 2009. "Bertell Ollman on Hannity and Colmes." Available at Bertell Ollman on Hannity and Colmes - YouTube.
- Ollman, Bertell. 2017. "Email from Bertell Ollman to Clyde W. Barrow." November 28.
- Rader, Melvin. 1973. "Review of *Alienation: Marx's Conception of Man in Capitalist Society*, by Bertell Ollman." *Social Theory and Practice* 2, no. 3: 373–9.
- Rensenbrink, John. 1982. "CNPS and NPS: Pitfalls and Prospects." *New Political Science* 2, no. 4: 93–8.
- Seigel, J.E. 1973. "Review of *Alienation: Marx's Conception of Man in Capitalist Society*, Bertell Ollman." *History and Theory* 12, no. 3: 329–42.
- Toll, John S. 1981. "Statement by John S. Toll to the University of Maryland Board of Regents." in *Ollman v. Toll* 518 F. Supp. 1196 (D. Md. 1981), Decided July 27, 1981. (Civ. No. H-78-1402 United States District Court, District of Maryland).
- T.R.F. 1972. "Review of *Alienation: Marx's Conception of Man in Capitalist Society*, by Bertell Ollman." *The Review of Metaphysics* 25, no. 4 (June): 764.

See also

Marxism; Critical Pedagogy; Academic Repression

209. Olson, Laura Katz

Laura Katz Olson (b. July 25, 1945) is Distinguished Professor of Political Science at Lehigh University, where she has spent her entire academic career (1974–present), and occasionally serving as department chair. Olson was raised in the Bronx borough of New York City. She attended the High School of Music & Art, where she played the violin. Olson received her bachelor's degree from the City College of New York and spent the next two years traveling through Western Europe and South America. She returned to earn an M.A. and Ph.D. in Political Science at the University of Colorado, Boulder (1974). She immediately joined the Department of Political Science at Lehigh University rising through the ranks to become a Full Professor in 1985 and a Distinguished Professor in 2017. Her daughter, Alix Olson, is Assistant Professor of Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies at Emory University. Olson was an early member and activist of the Caucus for a New Political Science. She was a leading figure in the movement to have the CNPS become an Organized Section of the American Political Science Association in 1991.

Throughout her career, Dr. Olson's research has focused on the politics, policy, and political economy of aging and healthcare in the United States. She has authored five books, including *The Political Economy of Aging: The State, Private Power, and Social Welfare* (1982), *The Politics of Medicaid* (2010), and *Ethically Challenged: Private Equity Storms U.S. Health Care* (2022). She has edited or co-edited multiple books, including *Public Policy and Aging: The Politics of Growing Old in America* (1983) and *Age Through Ethnic Lenses: Caring for the Elderly in a Multicultural Society* (2001). Olson has authored two novels, *Heart Sounds* (2004) and *Wrinkled Rebels* (2024), as well as numerous articles in scholarly journals, such as *New Political Science*, *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law*, and the *Journal of Race, Gender and Class*.

Dr. Olson's most recent book, *Ethically Challenged: Private Equity Storms U.S. Health Care*, examines the scope, practices, and impact of private equity (PE) in the U.S. healthcare provider landscape. With chapters devoted to PE investments in dentistry, home-

care and hospice, substance abuse and eating disorders, autism spectrum disorder, and emergency medical transport, she unmasks the predatory practices of an industry driven by short-term returns gained at the expense of some of the most vulnerable members of society, including children and the elderly. Fueling these profits are public expenditures from Medicaid and Medicare, as well as commercial insurance and private payments. Central to the PE model is the acquisition of a service provider in a target market segment, the extraction of as much value from the purchased asset through restructuring, by saddling the acquisition with the debt of the purchase, and then "exiting" the investment altogether with the sale of the service provider to another entity at a large return on the initial investment. Dr. Olson's research offers a rare glimpse into the opaque world of private equity and a critical assessment of its impact on patient outcomes and cost of health care.

In *The Politics of Medicaid*, Dr. Olson makes legible the tangled web of Medicaid by offering an overview of the program, its historical development, the structural funding incentives between state and federal governments, the political terrain upon which battles over welfare medicine are waged, the systemic inequity produced and reproduced by the system, and the disproportionate impact on access and outcomes for women, people of color, and the elderly. The book is an important contribution to Medicaid scholarship, but it also exemplifies the concept of a critical political science. Olson's empirical research, her attention to the ideological currents of Medicaid policy and politics (e.g., "deserving poor," "personal responsibility," etc.), and her foregrounding of the interests of the poor and marginalized, who are the subjects of Medicaid, results in a powerful work of political economy in the richest sense.

During her distinguished career, Dr. Olson's politically engaged scholarship has contributed to the development of critical political science over many decades. Her work has consistently challenged, and disproved the hegemonic discourse that private industry can deliver better healthcare outcomes at a cheaper price. Instead, as Olson's empirical research and critical perspective demonstrate, the U.S. healthcare landscape is driven by neoliberal ideology, where capital extracts value at a multitude of sites from

broken and disjointed healthcare delivery and payer systems. This extraction of value, and the inefficiencies it entails, provide a powerful explanation for the comparatively high costs of U.S. care in relation to its comparatively poor outcomes. The interests of those who profit from the U.S. health care system remain a significant barrier to transformational reform of that system. Olson's work has a political perspective, one that is concerned with the impact and consequences of health and aging policy on people's lives. Her political imagination is not limited by existing debates and policy positions, and she is not aiming to advise policy makers within the confines of narrow debates. Instead, as an intersectional feminist, her critiques foreground the needs and interests of women, the poor, people of color, and other marginalized groups, and her work lays bare the ways the current health care system fails the very people it is supposed to serve in the United States.

MICHAEL STEIN

References

- Katz Olson, Laura. 1982. *The Political Economy of Aging: The State, Private Power, and Social Welfare*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Katz Olson, Laura, ed. 2001. *Age Through Ethnic Lenses: Caring for the Elderly in a Multicultural Society*. Boulder, CO: Rowman and Littlefield Publishing Co.
- Katz Olson, Laura. 2004. *Heart Sounds*. Boulder, CO: Krummholz Press.
- Katz Olson, Laura. 2010. *The Politics of Medicaid*. New York, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Katz Olson, Laura. 2022. *Ethically Challenged: Private Equity Storms U.S. Health Care*. Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Katz Olson, Laura and William Browne, eds. 1983. *Public Policy and Aging: The Politics of Growing Old in America*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

See also

Critical Political Economy; Feminist Critiques; Intersectionality; Exploitation; Poverty

210. Panitch, Leo V.

Leo V. Panitch (May 3, 1945 Winnipeg, Canada–December 19, 2020 Toronto, Canada) was a prominent socialist intellectual and activist in Canada, where he worked as Professor of Political Science at Carleton University (1972–84) and York University (1984–2016). He was also editor of the world-recognized *Socialist Register* (1985–2020), where he succeeded Ralph Miliband. Panitch is best known for his extensive research – spanning over 100 publications – on social democracy, state theory, imperialism, and socialist strategy.

Panitch grew up in a working-class Jewish family in North Winnipeg. He completed a B.A. in Economics and Political Science at the University of Manitoba (1967). His pursuit of graduate studies took him to England, where he earned an M.S. and Ph.D. at the London School of Economics (1974). Panitch studied under Ralph Miliband at LSE, who supervised his doctoral dissertation that was later published as *Social Democracy and Industrial Militancy* (1976). This study examined the role of the British Labour Party in postwar state economic management, in particular its role in securing wage restraint from the trade unions by means of an incomes policy. This work expanded on themes from Panitch's earliest writings on the contradictory development of British social democracy (Panitch 1971). The study also opened new avenues of research on trade unions and the capitalist state, which is a theme that defined the first phase of Panitch's intellectual trajectory.

Panitch was deeply influenced by the Marxist debate on state theory that emerged from the political ferment of the 1960s and 1970s, but he was equally frustrated by its descent into polarized and abstract scholarly disputation. Soon after taking a post at Carleton University in 1972, Panitch gathered a like-minded group of politically committed scholars to collaborate on a project that became *The Canadian State* (1977). Panitch's intervention in the state debate made several original contributions, such as distilling key insights from rival theoretical approaches, integrating competing approaches into a historically and empirically grounded research agenda for the concrete analysis of actually existing states, and exposing critical blind

spots in existing Marxist scholarship, namely the dynamic relationship between trade unions and the state (Barrow 2021).

While state theorists had observed a general shift in the locus of political decision-making from parliaments to technocratic policy-making networks, these same theorists tended to neglect the specific incorporation of trade unions into the economic, legal, and other state apparatuses. Panitch's distinct research on corporatism and "industrial legality" took major steps toward filling this gap, mainly by examining the different ways that states channeled workplace struggles into legal institutional arrangement, while confining trade union demands within the limits of capitalist accumulation. Amid turbulent waves of industrial militancy throughout the 1970s, Panitch demonstrated how corporatism became a primary vehicle for "legitimizing and administering working-class sacrifices 'in the national interest'," with little compensation for labor in other arenas as capital increasingly refused all compromise with labor (Panitch 1986, 206). While in the juridified sphere of industrial relations, states increasingly resorted to ad hoc and restrictive measures to undermine collective bargaining rights exemplifying a shift "from consent to coercion" in the political incorporation of working classes (Panitch and Swartz 1985).

A second phase of Panitch's writing continued to explore working-class politics through the period of capitalist downturn and the ascendance of neoliberalism. Panitch took stock of the overlapping impasse of social democracy, the resurgence of "parliamentary socialism," and the intensifying contradictions of liberal democracy. These were essential themes in Panitch's writings gathered as a book on *Working Class Politics in Crisis* (1986) and in his essays written for the *Socialist Register*. In 1984, Panitch joined the Department of Political Science at York University in Toronto and around the same time he began co-editing his first volume of the *Socialist Register* on the theme "Social Democracy and After" (Miliband et al. 1985–86). This work deepened his longstanding intellectual collaboration with the *Socialist Register*'s founder Ralph Miliband. Panitch explored how social democracy's truncated form of politics had inscribed the contradictions of capitalist state economic management into the internal organizations

of the working class, and he now traced how these fissures widened in the face of capitalist crisis: trade unions were unable to remain responsive to their base while administering wage restraint, while social democratic parties strained to sell their traditional political role of “planning plus class harmony” to either capital or labor.

A radical path out of the impasse was posed by a series of resurgent left movements within labor parties across the advanced capitalist countries, which challenged the limits of inherited party bureaucracies and eroding liberal democratic institutions. Panitch and Colin Leys’ book, *The End of Parliamentary Socialism* (1997) provided a sustained post-mortem of one important example of this trend: namely, the Bennite new left inside the British Labour Party. Panitch and Leys dissected the political defeat of this new socialist left as a key development that paved the way for the rise of Tony Blair’s “Third Way.” Despite their failures in Britain and elsewhere, Panitch considered the new left’s ideas for transforming unions into agencies of political education and popular mobilization, and for democratizing party and state, to be important and innovative even if they remained “mostly speculative and incomplete” (Panitch and Leys 1997, 12). He tried to set these ideas on firmer foundations in *A Different Kind of State?* (Albo, Langille, and Panitch 1993) and *Renewing Socialism* (2001) before returning to these questions again in the last years of his writing.

Beginning in the mid-1990s, Panitch turned his attention to the internationalization of the neoliberal state and the consolidation of a global financialized capitalism under the hegemony of US Empire and this work marks the third and final phase of his work. Panitch’s path-breaking essay on “Globalization and the State” reset the terms of mainstream academic discussion, which pitted “states vs. markets,” and a left debate, which revolved around concerns that the internationalization of capital had bypassed states (Panitch 1994). Panitch reconceptualized globalization as a “a development not external to states but internal to them” (Panitch and Gindin 2005, 142). To this extent, nation-states were not declining or retreating, but rather reorganizing themselves by developing new bureaucratic and legal capacities for the reproduction of capital accumulation on a global scale.

Panitch and Sam Gindin’s *The Making of Global Capitalism* (2012) charted the historic rise of the “quite distinctive imperial state” that could constitute and superintend this first truly integrated global capitalism. The U.S. state, in particular, the U.S. Treasury and Federal Reserve, provided the indispensable institutional sinews that supported expanding global markets, offering unparalleled coordinating capacities and economic instruments for the management of the world economy. The political implications of their new conception of globalization and their notion of an “informal empire,” which bore little resemblance to past formal empires, posed a serious challenge to those awaiting the terminal signs of American economic decline or the resurgence of inter-imperial rivalry. Panitch and Gindin suggested that these views missed the point by fundamentally misreading the nature of capitalist competition and the state system in the neoliberal era. The transformed conditions of global capitalism equally make the search for a progressive national bourgeoisie with which to ally an elusive one for the social democratic left. The project of rebuilding socialism instead would now require the mobilization of new mass movements to confront and transform local class and state structures that are thoroughly enmeshed in global capitalist relations. Importantly, Panitch and Gindin insisted that it was necessary to find new organizational forms appropriate to this task, because the “working-class political institutions that fostered the socialist idea in the twentieth century proved unsuitable for realizing it” (Panitch and Gindin 2012, 339).

As new efforts to revive mass socialist politics intensified in the 2010s, Panitch placed renewed focus on these problems in a series of essays intended to rethink socialist strategy and the questions of a class-party-state (Panitch 2015, 2018), while making another close inspection of the familiar British case, where a resurgent Labour new left under Jeremy Corbyn had taken form (Panitch and Leys 2020). As with his interventions in previous debates – on crisis theory, state theory, and imperialism – Panitch called on the Marxist left to rid itself of the lingering residues of mechanistic and dogmatic thinking. This meant accepting the historical openness of the class struggle and embracing the notion that there is nothing automatic about the development of class consciousness or socialist politics. By extension, it also meant

taking seriously the “problem of organization” in the historic task of “transforming the proletariat into a class” (Panitch 2015). And it would no doubt entail a long patient process of organizational innovation, party building, and mass popular education to develop a genuine democratic socialist politics unlike the sclerotic forms of Social Democracy and Communism that came before it. As he had all his life, Panitch understood this task as both a theoretical and a personal challenge: a commitment to the theoretical development of a critical political science and the practice of an engaged public intellectual.

GREG ALBO AND ALAN ZUEGE

References

- Albo, Greg, David Langille, and Leo Panitch, eds. 1993. *A Different Kind of State? Popular Power and Democratic Administration*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Albo, Greg, Stephen Maher, and Alan Zuege, eds. 2021. *State Transformations: Classes, Strategy, Socialism*. Leiden: Brill.
- Barrow, Clyde. 2021. “From the Canadian State to the Making of Global Capitalism,” in Greg Albo, Stephen Maher, and Alan Zuege, eds. *State Transformations: Classes, Strategy, Socialism*. Leiden: Brill.
- Miliband, Ralph, John Saville, Marcel Liebman, and Leo Panitch, eds. 1985–86. *Socialist Register 1985/86: Social Democracy and After*. London: Merlin Press.
- Panitch, Leo. 1971. “Ideology and Integration: The Case of the British Labour Party.” *Political Studies* 19, no. 2: 184–200.
- Panitch, Leo, ed. 1977. *The Canadian State: Political Economy and Political Power*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Panitch, Leo. 1986. *Working Class Politics in Crisis: Essays on Labour and the State*. London: Verso.
- Panitch, Leo. 1994. “Globalisation and the State,” in *Socialist Register 1994: Between Globalism and Nationalism*. London: Merlin Press.
- Panitch, Leo. 2001. *Renewing Socialism: Transforming Democracy, Strategy, and Imagination*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Panitch, Leo. 2015. “The Two Revolutionary Classes of the Manifesto,” in Terrell Carver and James Farr, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to The Communist Manifesto*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Panitch, Leo. 2018. “Democratizing the Party and the State: Transcending the Limits of the Left,” in Paul Gray, ed. *From the Streets to the State: Changing the World by Taking Power*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Panitch, Leo and Sam Gindin. 2005. “Euro-Capitalism and American Empire,” in David Coates, ed., *Varieties of Capitalism, Varieties of Approaches*. London: Macmillan-Palgrave.
- Panitch, Leo and Sam Gindin. 2012. *The Making of Global Capitalism: The Political Economy of American Empire*. London: Verso Books.
- Panitch, Leo and Colin Leys. 1997. *The End of Parliamentary Socialism: From New Left to New Labour*. London: Verso Books.
- Panitch, Leo and Colin Leys. 2020. *Searching for Socialism: The Project of the Labour New Left from Benn to Corbyn*. London: Verso Books.
- Panitch, Leo and Donald Swartz. 1985. *From Consent to Coercion: The Assault on Trade Union Freedoms*. Toronto: Garamond.

See also

Socialist Register; Marxism; Theories of the State; Theories of Imperialism; Ralph Miliband

211. Parenti, Michael

Michael J. Parenti (b. 1933 New York City), is a political analyst, author, and activist, who is considered one of the most influential figures in American political science. A distinguished academic and committed Marxist, Parenti is best known for his critical analyses of the United States political system, mass media, and foreign policy. He has authored 24 books and is recognized as one of the great orators of the American Left, beloved for his thoughtful expositions, fierce polemical style, and charming sense of humor.

Parenti was raised in a working-class Italian-American family in East Harlem, where he attended the now-historic Benjamin Franklin High School. The school's principal, celebrated educator Dr. Leonard Covello, strived to empower East Harlem's Italian youth. Parenti (2013) was deeply inspired by the success of Covello's protégé Vito Anthony Marcantonio, a brilliant young Italian-American congressman and outspoken advocate for East Harlem's working-class and immigrant communities.

Parenti received his B.A. in Political Science from the City College of New York (1955). He was then awarded a teaching fellowship at Brown University, where he received his M.A. (1957). Parenti went on to study Political Science at Yale University, where he received his Ph.D. and wrote his dissertation, "Ethnic and Political Attitudes: A Depth Study of Italian Americans" (1962), which argued that although Italian-Americans had largely *acculturated*, they had not assimilated as an ethnic political block.

As a postdoctoral fellow at Yale University in the late 1960s, Parenti became radicalized. Drawn to the struggle for civil rights and shocked by the atrocities of the Vietnam War, Parenti began studying Marxist literature and became very active in the anti-war movement, working closely with peace activist William Sloane Coffin. In 1967, Parenti (2013) was arrested and brutalized by police officers while taking part in an anti-war protest outside of an Army recruitment center in New Haven.

In May of 1970, Parenti and his dear friend Dr. Philip Meranto, both then highly-respected faculty members at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, participated in historic student-led demonstrations in Urbana

which broke out in response to the massacre of four students at Kent State University days earlier by the Ohio National Guard. During the demonstrations, which were endorsed by the American Association of University Professors and various student organizations, police officers began clubbing and kicking Parenti (Heim 2011). Meranto intervened to shield Parenti, but both men were beaten, injured, arrested, and charged with assaulting police officers.

Fired from the University of Illinois, Parenti took a position at the University of Vermont in the fall of 1970, where he was then approved for early tenure by the Political Science Department, faculty governance committees, and University president. In an unprecedented decision, the University's Board of Trustees voted to block Parenti's reappointment and tenure.

Around this time, Parenti published his political science textbook *Democracy for the Few* (1974). One of Parenti's major contributions to the field of political science, *Democracy for the Few* explains how corporate power manipulates mass media and undermines democratic political institutions, perpetuating economic inequalities and consolidating power within an increasingly militarized and unsustainable "corporate state." There have been nine revised and updated editions of *Democracy for the Few*, and it remains an important and widely utilized political science textbook.

In 1974, Parenti also ran for the U.S. House of Representatives in Vermont on the Liberty Union Party ticket. Parenti ran an impressive campaign, coming in third place with 7.1 percent of the vote. During this time, Parenti became friends with fellow Liberty Union Party member Bernie Sanders. Later, Parenti supported Sanders's successful campaign for mayor of Burlington in 1981.

In 1975, Parenti was a visiting professor at Cornell University when former Prime Minister of South Vietnam Nguyen Cao Ky was invited to speak on campus. Parenti appeared at the event to issue a statement on behalf of student groups and faculty, denouncing the former Prime Minister's record. Ky was ultimately booed off the stage by students in the audience, and, in a contentious decision, the University terminated Parenti for his role in the incident. Over the years, Parenti taught at a number of universities, but his continued activism and

increasingly explicit Marxist politics resulted in what has often been characterized as the *blacklisting* of Parenti from academia.

By the 1980s, Parenti began building what would become a hugely influential career as a public intellectual, publishing many books and hundreds of articles, making frequent appearances on television and radio programs, and giving public lectures across the country. Some of Parenti's books include: *Power and The Powerless* (1978), *The Sword and the Dollar: Imperialism, Revolution, and the Arms Race* (1988), *Make Believe Media: The Politics of Entertainment* (1992), *Blackshirts and Reds: Rational Fascism and the Overthrow of Communism* (1997), *To Kill a Nation: The Attack on Yugoslavia* (2002), *The Assassination of Julius Caesar: A People's History of Ancient Rome* (2003), and many others.

Among Parenti's books, *Inventing Reality: The Politics of News Media* (1986) was particularly influential. In this book, Parenti explores questions related to political bias in corporate news media and identifies several "methods of misrepresentation" utilized widely in corporate media to generate public support for oppressive power structures and imperialist foreign policy. Published two years before Chomsky and Herman's *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media* (1988), Parenti's *Inventing Reality* was a pioneering work in critical studies of mass media.

In the 1980s, Parenti became an associate fellow at the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington, D.C. In the early 1990s, Parenti moved to Berkeley, California, where he stayed for the next 30 years, taking guest teaching appointments at UC Northridge in Los Angeles, California and the University of Christ Church in New Zealand. Over the years, he also served on the advisory editorial boards of academic journals such as *New Political Science* and *Nature, Society and Thought*, and contributed to various progressive political organizations, including Project Censored, Education Without Borders, and many others.

Parenti has been recognized with several prestigious awards for his work, including Career Achievement Award from the Caucus for a New Political Science in 2003, a Certificate of Special Congressional Recognition in 2007, and an American Book Award for Lifetime Achievement in 2014. Dr. Michael Parenti's work has had a profound impact on political science, and his influence continues to extend well beyond the world of academia.

DUSTEN R. PETTENGILL

References

- Chomsky, Noam and Edward S. Hermann. 1988. *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Heim, Eric. 2011. "The 1970 Student Strike in Protest of Kent State Killings." The Public i. <http://publici.ucimc.org/2011/05/1970-student-strike-in-protest-of-kent-state-killings/>.
- Parenti, Michael. 1962. "Ethnic and Political Attitudes: A Depth Study of Italian Americans." PhD Dissertation, Yale University.
- Parenti, Michael. 1974. *Democracy for the Few*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Parenti, Michael. 1978. *Power and The Powerless*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Parenti, Michael. 1986. *Inventing Reality: The Politics of News Media*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Parenti, Michael. 1989. *The Sword and the Dollar: Imperialism, Revolution, and the Arms Race*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Parenti, Michael. 1992. *Make Believe Media: The Politics of Entertainment*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Parenti, Michael. 1997. *Blackshirts and Reds: Rational Fascism and the Overthrow of Communism*. San Francisco: City Lights Press.
- Parenti, Michael. 2000. *To Kill a Nation: The Attack on Yugoslavia*. London: Verso.
- Parenti, Michael. 2003. *The Assassination of Julius Caesar: A People's History of Ancient Rome*. New York: New Press.
- Parenti, Michael. 2013. *Waiting for Yesterday: Pages from a Street Kid's Life*. New York: Bordighera Press.

See also

Marxism; Socialism; Critical Media Studies

212. Pateman, Carole

Carole Pateman (b. December 11, 1940–) is one of the most frequently cited and highly acclaimed political scientists in the world. She is known primarily for her contributions to democratic theory and feminist theory, although these should not be understood as separate domains of theory but rather closely related concerns. Indeed, she can be considered a key figure in the development of a distinctly *feminist* democratic theory.

Born to a working-class family in a small village in Sussex, England, she left school at 16. After a series of low-wage clerical jobs, in 1963 she was accepted into a two-year program at Ruskin College in Oxford. In 1965, as the only woman to sit for the Oxford University Post-Graduate Diploma in Political Science and Economics exam (she earned distinction), she matriculated to Oxford University where she earned her doctoral degree. Upon completing her dissertation, her advisor, Brian Barry, politely asked if he might show it to Cambridge University Press. She consented and not long after was handed a published book – *Participation and Democratic Theory* (1970), which, according to Google Scholar, has been cited over 11,000 times. In total citations, she ranks eighth on the list for emeriti faculty; she would rank second on the list of non-emeriti political theorists with over 25,000 total citations (Kim and Grofman 2019).

Pateman's teaching career began in 1972 in Australia at the University of Sydney. Finding the environment to be less than welcoming for women faculty, she applied for and often received fellowships and visiting professorships elsewhere, including at Stanford and Princeton. In 1990 she joined the faculty at UCLA, from which she retired as a Distinguished Professor Emerita in 2011. Additional appointments have been at the Swedish Council for Research in the Humanities and Social Sciences, University of British Columbia, University of Manchester, and Cardiff University. She has been elected a member of the British Academy, the American Academy of Arts & Sciences, and the Learned Society of Wales. She was the first woman elected president of the International Political Science Association (1991–94), and was president of the American Political Science Association

(2010–11). In 2012 she was awarded the Johan Skytte Prize from Uppsalla University, one of the most prestigious international awards in political science. She holds honorary doctorates from the Australian National University (1998), the National University of Ireland (2005), and Helsinki University (2006).

A critical orientation to questions of consent and systems of domination and subordination is the central animating feature of her work (On and Pateman 2010). In *Participation in Democratic Theory*, she challenges the idea that the political participation of ordinary citizens must be strictly limited, and employs both theory and empirical evidence to show that the workplace can be an important training ground for democracy. Pateman's idea of a democratic "spillover effect" is one of the most frequently cited concepts in democratic theory.

Pateman then shifted her focus onto the liberal notion of the social contract. Her work raises the question of how, and whether, a person in a subordinate position (e.g., women and workers) can be said to freely consent to a contract. In *The Problem of Political Obligation* (1979), *The Sexual Contract* (1988), *Disorder of Women* (1989), and *Contract and Domination* (with C.W. Mills 2007), Pateman asks whether people in a liberal society can really be said to have consented to a political order they have no choice about, and whether they can be said to be free when their lives are deeply embedded in systems of domination. Through a critical engagement with Hobbes and Locke in *The Sexual Contract*, one of her most-read works, Pateman shows that women were directly excluded from the social contract, relegated to the private realm under the control of their husbands and fathers and rendered incapable of freely entering a contract. She extends this argument from the marriage contract to the employment contract and argues, more broadly, that if liberalism rests on the premise of free and equal citizens, it excludes all those who are neither free nor equal.

Pateman also attacks a central idea of liberalism, property in the person. Crucial to property is its alienability. This means that people should freely be able to effectively sell any part of themselves, from their labor to parts of their bodies or even their whole self. However, as Pateman shows (2002), the idea of property in the person rests on the

same rickety scaffolding as the social contract idea of free and equal persons.

The concern regarding systems of domination ultimately leads to the work with which she closed her career, the notion of a guaranteed basic income. As she shows in her other work, liberal capitalism is best understood as a system of domination and subordination. While it would not eliminate exploitation, a guaranteed basic income makes the notion of autonomy – and therefore consent – meaningful for everyone, and lays the foundation for a truly participatory democracy.

MARK KASWAN

References

- Kim, Hannah June, and Bernard Grofman. 2019. "The Political Science 400: With Citation Counts by Cohort, Gender, and Subfield." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 52, no. 2: 296–311.
- On, Steve, and Carole Pateman. 2010. "Interview with Carole Pateman by Steve On." *Contemporary Political Theory* 9: 239–50.
- Pateman, Carole. 1970. *Participation and Democratic Theory*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Pateman, Carole. 1979. *The Problem of Political Obligation*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Pateman, Carole. 1988. *The Sexual Contract*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Pateman, Carole. 1989. *The Disorder of Women: Democracy, Feminism and Political Theory*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.
- Pateman, Carole. 2002. "Self-Ownership and Property in the Person: Democratization and a Tale of Two Concepts." *Journal of Political Philosophy* 10, no. 1: 20–53.
- Pateman, Carole, and Charles W. Mills. 2007. *Contract and Domination*. Cambridge, UK; Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Further readings

- O'Neill, Daniel I., Mary Lyndon Shanley, and Iris Marion Young, eds. 2008. *Illusion of Consent: Engaging with Carole Pateman*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

See also

Feminist Critiques; Democratic Theory; Economic Democracy; Charles Mills

213. Peschek, Joseph G.

Joseph G. Peschek (b. June 30, 1952) was born in Tacoma, Washington. He received his B.A. in Political Science from the University of Washington (1974) and his Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of Massachusetts-Amherst (1984). His dissertation adviser was Kenneth M. Dolbeare. Peschek was influenced by intellectual currents growing out of the 1960s and 1970s New Left, including new forms of radical political economy, theories of the state, and the power structure analysis tradition of C. Wright Mills and G. William Domhoff (Peschek 2018, 2021). He was also influenced by the “corporate liberal” interpretation of modern American political history that focuses attention on the ways that political and economic elites organize to rationalize and maintain democratic capitalism and to fend off more radical challenges to its core structure. Most of Peschek’s academic career was spent at Hamline University in St. Paul, Minnesota, where he retired and was appointed Professor Emeritus of Political Science in 2022.

Peschek’s (1987) first book was about the role of private policy-planning organizations in the rightward shift in American politics in the 1970s and 1980s. Peschek saw these groups not as objective producers of research and policy recommendations, but as active agents linked to corporate and business power blocs, which in turn shaped the ideological shifts and political regroupings in the United States during a time of economic crisis and political change. He set the activity of policy planning organizations against the context of a declining postwar political economy and the extensive political mobilization of corporate elites and the business community in response to that decline in the 1970s. Five important policy groups from this period, both centrist and conservative, were analysed in the book: the American Enterprise Institute, the Brookings Institution, the Heritage Foundation, the Institute for Contemporary Studies, and the Trilateral Commission. Relating the analyses of policy-planners to real world developments from the early 1970s through the mid-1980s, Peschek studied the evolving perspectives and policy debates of these groups in the substantive areas of the international economy, foreign policy and national security, domes-

tic economics, and political institutions and democratic practices.

Peschek’s next project, undertaken with his graduate student friend and collaborator William F. Grover, was oriented to the teaching of American politics at the college-level. They developed a radical anthology, titled *Voices of Dissent: Critical Readings in American Politics*, intended principally as a supplemental text in American government and politics courses. The book went through nine editions from 1993 to 2013. Grover’s and Peschek’s goal was to provide a “systematic series of critical perspectives on American politics that goes beyond the range of debate between mainstream liberalism and conservatism ... Political economy, and the tensions between capitalism and democracy, is a recurrent feature of the selections” (Grover and Peschek 1993, vii). Grover and Peschek placed the treatment of traditional governmental and political institutions and processes after, and in the context of, chapters on “structure” that were viewed as having explanatory priority and that included political economy, ideology and culture, as well as constitutional and state structures.

In later editions of *Voices of Dissent*, Peschek contributed his own analyses of the Clinton, Bush, and Obama presidencies, drawing on Grover’s structural critique of the Carter and Reagan years (Grover 1989). This research entered into a book that Grover and Peschek published in 2014, *The Unsustainable Presidency: Clinton, Bush, Obama and Beyond* (Grover and Peschek 2014). They built on, but also criticized the field of presidency studies in political science, which they thought had a restrictive concept of structure. They offered an alternative structural analysis, grounded in political economy, to better contextualize the presidencies of Clinton, Bush, and Obama, and to show how each was buffeted by the pursuit of conventional and limited understandings of “economic growth” and “national security.”

From 2002 to 2008, Peschek was Editor of *New Political Science*, the flagship scholarly journal of the Caucus for a New Political Science (later the Caucus for a Critical Political Science). One product of this period was a special issue, later published as a book, on the “politics of empire” that covered war, terror, and hegemony during the Bush years (Peschek 2006). Peschek has remained active in the Caucus in several capacities and regu-

larly contributes book reviews to the journal. His research in recent years has focused on “Trumpism” as a form of authoritarian populist nationalism and on transformative alternatives to contemporary capitalism, especially from newly invigorated traditions of democratic socialism.

WILLIAM F. GROVER

References

- Grover, William F. 1989. *The President as Prisoner: A Structural Critique of the Carter and Reagan Years*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Grover, William F. and Joseph G. Peschek, eds. 1993. *Voices of Dissent: Critical Readings in American Politics*, 1st Edition. New York: HarperCollins.
- Grover, William F. and Joseph G. Peschek. 2014. *The Unsustainable Presidency: Clinton, Bush, Obama and Beyond*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Peschek, Joseph G. 1987. *Policy-Planning Organizations: Elite Agendas and America's Rightward Turn*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Peschek, Joseph G., ed. 2006. *The Politics of Empire: War, Terror and Hegemony*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Peschek, Joseph G. 2018. “The Policy-Planning Network, Class Dominance, and the Challenge to Political Science.” In *Studying the Power Elite: Fifty Years of Who Rules America?*, by G. William Domhoff and Eleven Other Authors, 105–15. New York and London: Routledge.
- Peschek, Joseph G. 2021. “C. Wright Mills and the Analysis of Power in American Politics.” In *The Routledge International Handbook of C. Wright Mills Studies*, edited by Jon Frauley, 155–67. New York and London: Routledge.

See also

Corporate Power; G. William Domhoff; C. Wright Mills; Policy-Planning Organization; Power Structure Analysis

214. Petchesky, Rosalind

Rosalind Petchesky (born Bay City, TX, 16 August, 1942), is a leading theorist on international reproductive and sexual rights. Her career reflects a record of outstanding activism and a distinguished record of teaching and scholarship committed to political, social and gender justice. She obtained her Ph.D. in Political Science in 1974 from Columbia University. She also holds an M.A. from Columbia University and a B.A. from Smith College. She is now Distinguished Professor Emerita of Political Science, Hunter College and the Graduate Center, City University of New York. She joined the faculty of Hunter College, City University of New York in 1987. Prior to that, she held appointments at Ramapo College of New Jersey and Bryn Mawr College.

Drawing upon ethics, political philosophy, feminist theory, history, political science, sociology, demography, semiotics, and law, Petchesky integrates many types of scholarly analyses to clarify the issues of reproductive and sexual rights in the context of transnational feminisms and gender and economic justice as well as geopolitics and war. Her most widely read and cited articles include "Owning and Disowning the Body: A Reflection," in *The Oxford Handbook of Transnational Feminist Movements* (2015) and "Fetal Images: The Power of Visual Culture in the Politics of Reproduction" (1987). Her first book, *Abortion and Women's Choice: The State, Sexuality, and Reproductive Freedom* (1990), was followed by *Global Prescriptions: Gendering Health and Human Rights* (2003), and *Sexuality, Health and Human Rights* (2008), co-authored with Sonia Correa and Richard Parker.

Along with these research contributions in the field of reproductive and sexual health and rights, during the 1990s Petchesky initiated and coordinated the International Reproductive Rights Research Action Group (IRRRAG) in its work of assessing, across cultures, women's own views of their reproductive and sexual lives, in the context of work, family, and particular social conditions. Out of this collaboration, she edited IRRRAG's seven-country study, *Negotiating Reproductive Rights* (1998) and led the IRRRAG teams in their participation in United Nations conferences on population

and development (Cairo 1994) and women (Beijing 1995). She has also been part of the international consortium, Sexuality Policy Watch (www.sxpolitics.org), which has coordinated numerous multi-country, multi-site comparative studies of national and international policies and practices affecting sexuality and sexual rights.

Petchesky is the recipient of numerous awards, fellowships, and honors including the First Distinguished Professor Lectureship at Hunter College and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation's MacArthur Fellows ("genius") Award. She was also the 2020 Charles McCoy Career Achievement Awardee of the Caucus for a New Political Science (now Critical Political Science) at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting. She is the recipient of several grants including from the United Nations Population Fund, Ford Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation Bellagio Conference Center, Aaron Diamond Foundation, and the Rockefeller Foundation. The first edition of *Abortion and Women's Choice*, which has been widely noted as a landmark study after it was first published in 1984, was winner of the American Historical Association's 1984 Joan Kelly Memorial Prize in Women's History and was cited by both the United States Supreme Court in *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* (1992) and the Supreme Court of Canada. *Abortion and Women's Choice* will be released by Verso Books in a new edition, with a new author's preface and foreword by Zillah Eisenstein, in early 2024 as part of Verso's Feminist Classics series.

In spring of 2013, Rosalind Petchesky retired from over 30 years of teaching at Hunter College and the CUNY Graduate Center (and nearly two decades teaching elsewhere before that). As Distinguished Professor Emerita, she is devoted to three main projects: political activism with Jewish Voice for Peace; renewed study of classical piano; and more time enjoying her two grandchildren, now living in Colorado. Since retiring, in collaboration with Jewish Voice for Peace-New York City, Petchesky focuses most of her work as a scholar and activist on the Palestinian struggle for justice and questions about the history and legacy of Zionism as a form of settler colonialism. Her most recent book, co-edited with Sarah Sills and Esther Farmer, is called *A Land With A People: Palestinians and Jews Confront*

Zionism, published by *Monthly Review Press* in fall of 2021. That book includes Petchesky's long historical essay, "Zionism's Twilight: Colonial Dreams, Racist Nightmares, Liberated Futures," as well as a memoir about her own experience as an anti-Zionist feminist. Dr. Petchesky's papers are housed in the Sophia Smith Collection at the Smith College Library and may be accessed online.

In earlier years, Professor Petchesky was chair of the trustee board of the London-based journal, *Reproductive Health Matters*, and a board member of the Women's Environment & Development Organization. More recently, in addition to her ongoing work with Jewish Voice for Peace, she was a steering committee member of Jews Against Islamophobia-New York City, advisory board member of the LGBT Unit of Human Rights Watch, a planning committee member for the Women's March-New York City (2018–19), and up to the present, is a member of the university-wide consortium, CUNY4Palestine.

MANAL A. JAMAL

References

- Corrêa, Sonia, Richard Parker, and Rosalind Petchesky. 2008. *Sexuality, Health and Human Rights*. London: Routledge.
- Farmer, Esther, Rosalind Petchesky, and Sarah Sills. 2021. *A Land With A People: Palestinians and Jews Confront Zionism, A Collection of Stories, Art, History, and Poetry*. NY: Monthly Review Press.
- Judd, Karen and Rosalind Petchesky, eds. 1998. *Negotiating Reproductive Rights: Women's Perspectives Across Countries and Cultures*. London and New York: Zed Books and St. Martin's Press.
- Petchesky, Rosalind. 1987. "Fetal Images: The Power of Visual Culture in the Politics of Reproduction." *Feminist Studies*, 13 no. 2 (Summer): 263–92.
- Petchesky, Rosalind. 1990. *Abortion and Woman's Choice: The State, Sexuality, and Reproductive Freedom*, 2nd revised edn. Lebanon, NH: Northeastern University.
- Petchesky, Rosalind. 2003. *Global Prescriptions: Gendering Health and Human Rights*. London: Zed Books.
- Petchesky, Rosalind. 2024. *Abortion and Women's Choice: The State, Sexuality, and Reproductive Freedom*, 3rd revised edn. London: Verso.
- Petchesky, Rosalind. 2015. "Owning and Disowning the Body: A Reflection." In *The Oxford Handbook of Transnational Feminist Movements*, ed. Rawwida Baksh and Wendy Harcourt, 252–70. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Petchesky, Rosalind. 2021. "Zionism's Twilight: Colonial Dreams, Racist Nightmares, Liberated Futures." In *A Land With A People*, edited by Farmer, Esther, Rosalind Petchesky, and Sarah Stills, 17–58. New York: Monthly Review Press.

215. Peterson, V. Spike

V. Spike Peterson (b. 1946, Sherman, Texas, USA) is an innovative thinker who has continuously raised complex questions that challenge both the narrow disciplinary boundaries of academia and the rigid structures and hierarchies of society more generally. Peterson traces the origin of her broad, inclusive, theoretical perspective to her specific life history, and her rejection of its early constraints (Peterson 2020a). Growing up in towns that were relatively small, predominantly white, and overwhelmingly conservative, Peterson admits she knew little about disparate communities, nor broader activities, such as the civil rights movement. However, stereotypically, she had learned to type, a skill that later supported her travels.

Peterson entered the University of Illinois, Urbana, where she claims to have discovered the world; a place where she learned about feminist issues, became involved in activist politics, developed a desire to travel, and began what she refers to as her own “political economy lesson” (Peterson 2020b). Peterson emancipated herself from parental support and utilized scholarships and temporary typing jobs to stay in college while spending the next three spring semesters visiting Mexico and other parts of the United States. In 1970, she earned a B.S. with Honors in Psychology and a minor in Philosophy. To celebrate, Peterson and a friend spent nine months traveling the world, after which she spent two years traveling in Europe and across northern Africa, before returning to the University of Illinois in 1975 to earn an M.A. in Social Science with foci on Anthropology and African Studies. She followed up her new degree with another three years of travel in Africa.

These travels gave Peterson the opportunity to reflect on some of the “big questions” that had originally drawn her to classes in Psychology and Philosophy, such as: “what are the sources of hierarchies?” or “why is there so much global inequality?” Peterson returned to school for a Ph.D. in hopes of being able to study the world she had seen during her travels. She enrolled in American University’s School of International Service, and was immediately frustrated by the traditional curriculum, and the minimal global experience among the faculty. Luckily,

Peterson encountered Professor Nicholas Onuf, who assisted her in fashioning a dissertation on gender and class in the early history of state formation.

Though many Political Science departments were not interested in critical perspectives, Peterson secured a position in the Political Science Department at the University of Arizona with the support of its Gender Studies program, which had been tasked with seeking a feminist hire. The new position gave Peterson the freedom to develop a “practice of political activism” in her teaching whereby she introduced discussions of racism and privilege, framed by her observations during her travels (Peterson 2020a). Meanwhile, she built supportive networks among critical thinkers in a broad array of fields through professional meetings and organizations.

At this point, feminist theory was beginning to make in-roads into International Relations through the work of scholars such as Cynthia Enloe, J. Ann Tickner, and Jean Bethke Elstain, who attacked the underpinnings of Realism (the dominant paradigm of Political Science and International Relations) for ignoring women and gender. In that vein, Peterson assembled an edited volume, *Gendered States: Feminist (Re)Visions of International Relations Theory* (Peterson 1992), where she argued specifically that feminists are engaged in a process that is “both deconstructive and reconstructive” (Peterson 1992, 9). This involves not only criticizing the current study and practice of International Relations as gendered, but further arguing that only those who utilize feminist lenses are able to understand the gendered construction of the state, and its broader ramifications for IR theory (Peterson 1992, 1). Meanwhile, Anne Sisson Runyan (a colleague from American University) persuaded Peterson to co-write a book examining in detail the impacts of gender worldwide. *Global Gender Issues* (Peterson and Runyan 1993, 1999, 2006), subsequently *Global Issues in the New Millenium* (Runyan and Peterson, 2010, 2014) has become a classic for both theoretical discussions and classroom use. It applied gendered lenses to major aspects of world politics to examine *inter alia* women as world leaders, gender differences in violence and economic issues, and women as trans-state actors.

The themes of asking the “big” interdisciplinary questions, having a global focus, criticizing existing theories, utilizing feminist lenses, and being concerned about inequity, especially in the distribution of wealth have remained consistent throughout Peterson’s writing. They were masterfully combined in Peterson’s next book, *A Critical Rewriting of Global Political Economy: Integrating Reproductive, Productive, and Virtual Economies* (2003). Here she forthrightly accepted the unpopular and potentially risky role of critic of the liberal/neoliberal economic order. In the process, Peterson utilized feminist theory within the RPV framework (Reproductive, Productive, Virtual) to examine in detail the ways in which the economic order, particularly in the age of globalization, is inequitable. The discourse concerning the importance of gender in understanding the economy continued in a number of Peterson’s subsequent publications (including Peterson 2005 and Peterson 2011). As discussions of gender evolved, Peterson shifted her analyses to incorporate LGBTQA concerns (Peterson 2013, Peterson 2014).

V. Spike Peterson is a currently a Professor of International Relations in the School of Government and Public Policy, with courtesy appointments in the Department of Gender and Women’s Studies, Institute for LGBT Studies, and Center for Latin American Studies. To date, in addition to her books, she has published more than 100 journal articles and book chapters. The significance of her scholarship has been recognized by a number of professional awards, including: Eminent Scholar Panel at the Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association (2004); Charles A. McCoy Career Achievement Award by New Political Science Section of the American Political Science Association (2016); LGBTQA Scholar Award by the LGBTQA Caucus of the International Studies Association, which cited her pioneering research in queer approaches to IR and IPE (2018).

Peterson currently serves on the editorial boards of the *International Feminist Journal of Politics*; *Globalizations*; *Journal of Women, Politics and Policy*; *New Political Science*; *Politics & Gender*; and *Perspectives: The Review of International Affairs*. Her scholarship has continued to be enriched by global positions, including being invited as Visiting

Scholar by Australian National University (1995); Visiting Research Scholar at the University of Bristol (1998); Visiting Research Scholar at the University of Göteborg (2000); Udall Center Public Policy Fellowship (2007); London School of Economics, Gender Institute and International Relations, London, Leverhulme Visiting Professorship (2007, 2008); Rockefeller Bellagio Scholarly Residency (2008); Associate Research Fellow, Gender Institute, London School of Economics (2008–11); Senior Research Fellow, Department of Geography, Durham University (2014); Leverhulme Visiting Professorship hosted by the Critical Global Politics unit, University of Manchester (2016); and a Richard Hodder-Williams Fellowship, School of Sociology, Politics and International Studies, University of Bristol (2018).

MEREDITH REID SARKEES

References

- Peterson, V. Spike, ed. 1992. *Gendered States: Feminist (Re)Visions of International Relations Theory*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Peterson, V. Spike. 2003. *A Critical Rewriting of Global Political Economy: Integrating Reproductive, Productive, and Virtual Economies*. London: Routledge.
- Peterson, V. Spike. 2005. “How (the Meaning of) Gender Matters in Political Economy.” *New Political Economy* 10, no. 4 (December): 499–521.
- Peterson, V. Spike. 2011. “Femininity: Culture, Ideology and Political Economy.” In *Feminism and International Relations: Conversations about the Past, Present and Future*, edited by J. Ann Tickner and Laura Sjoberg, 212–20. London and New York: Routledge.
- Peterson, V. Spike. 2013. “The Intended and Unintended Queering of States/Nations.” *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism* 13, no. 1 (April): 57–68.
- Peterson, V. Spike. 2014. “Sex Matters: A Queer History of Hierarchies.” *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 16, no. 3 (September): 389–409.
- Peterson, V. Spike. 2020a. “Women and the History of International Thought Project, Oral Histories.” Interview by Leverhulme Trust. https://soundcloud.com/dpir-oxford/v-spike-peterson?in=dpir-oxford/sets/women-and-the-history-of&utm_source=clipboard&utm_medium=text&utm_campaign=social_sharing.

- Peterson, V. Spike, 2020b. "Foundations of International Political Economy." Interview with Dr. Alexander Nunn, www.ipefoundations.org.uk/videos.
- Peterson, V. Spike, and Anne Sisson Runyan. 1993, 1999, 2006. *Global Gender Issues*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Runyan, Anne Sisson and V. Spike Peterson. 2010, 2014. *Global Gender Issues in the New Millennium*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Further readings

- Agathangelou, Anna M. and Marysia Zalewski. 2005. "Disturbing Hegemony? A Discussion of the Work and Politics of V. Spike Peterson." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 7, no. 2 (June): 308–17.
- "V. Spike Peterson." *School of Government and Public Policy, University of Arizona*. <https://sgpp.arizona.edu/people/v-spike-peterson>. Includes CV.

216. Petras, James

James Petras (b. January 17, 1937–) is Bartle Professor (Emeritus) of Sociology at Binghamton University and an Adjunct Professor at Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada. He received his B.A. from Boston University and Ph.D. from the University of California, Berkeley. Petras spent his entire academic career at Binghamton University, where he specialized in Development Studies, Latin America and the Caribbean, revolutionary movements, and class analysis. During his career, he received the Western Political Science Association's Best Dissertation Award (1968), the American Sociological Association's Career of Distinguished Service Award (Marxist Sociology Section), as well as the Kenny Award for Best Book on Labor Studies (2002). He was an early and prominent member of the Caucus for a New Political Science.

Petras is the author of more than 60 books published in 29 languages, and over 600 articles in professional journals that include the *American Sociological Review*, *British Journal of Sociology*, *Critical Sociology*, *New Political Science*, and the *Journal of Peasant Studies*. He has published over 2,000 articles in periodical publications such as the *New York Times*, *The Guardian*, *The Nation*, *Christian Science Monitor*, *Foreign Policy*, *New Left Review*, *Partisan Review*, *Canadian Dimension*, and *Le Monde Diplomatique*. Currently, he writes a monthly column for the Mexican newspaper, *La Jornada*. His later books, written after his "retirement," include *Globalization Unmasked: Imperialism in the 21st Century* (2001), which was translated and published in over 20 languages; and he has coauthored 32 of his books with Henry Veltmeyer. Some of these books include *The Dynamics of Social Change in Latin America* (2000), *System in Crisis* (2003), *Social Movements and State Power* (2003), *Empire with Imperialism* (2005), *Multinationals on Trial* (2006), *The New Extractivism: A Model for Latin America or the New Imperialism?* (2014), *Class Struggle in Latin America* (2017), and *Imperialism and Capitalism in the 21st Century* (2018).

Upon retirement as Professor Emeritus, Petras continues to engage the politics of capitalist development, imperialism, and the

class struggle as a non-university affiliated activist scholar with a research and political focus on Latin America and the Middle East, as well as imperialism, globalization, and leftist social movements. For the past 30 years he has shared with his companion in Marxist theory, the Canadian sociologist and frequent collaborator Henry Veltmeyer an annual sojourn to diverse sites of struggle in different Latin American countries not just to gather information on those struggles but to engage directly with different organizations and activists in the class struggle.

Petras' methodology has always involved more than interviewing the subjects of his research and political engagement to include an exchange of ideas that provides the subject of his research – social movement, union, and political activists – with his analysis of political developments across the world, while seeking reciprocity from those subjects regarding the dynamics of class struggle. Petras has engaged in extensive discussions with the leadership and activists in diverse social movements, such as the Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities (CONAIE) in Ecuador and the Movement Towards Socialism in Bolivia. He worked closely with the leadership of peasant movements in Paraguay and in particular the Rural Landless Workers Movement (MST) in Brazil. Many of his academic writings are archived by Rebelión.html, which is a medium of alternative information and opinions about political struggles across the world.

In 2010, the journal *Critical Sociology* and the Marxist Section of the American Sociological Association sponsored and published a festschrift (*Scholar and Revolutionary: An Appreciation*) in honor of his lifetime contributions to date in promoting a critical perspective on issues of sociological and political development. The various contributions to this festschrift honored Petras' political commitment, acuity, and rigor, as well as the political importance of his writings. His many writings are characterized by nuanced class and political analysis, which aims not just to describe and explain the complex dynamics of political development – exposing the reality behind appearances – but they seek to change the world, inform political practice, and contributing to the capacity of the working class to expose the machinations of imperial rule and the capitalist class.

Petras's contributions to critical political science are too numerous to mention. They span a lifetime (over 50 years) of writings on themes as diverse as U.S. imperialism in Latin America, the political economy and politics of development, and the complex dynamics of the class struggle in diverse contexts, including Latin America, but also the U.S., and the Middle East, including Zionism and the Palestine Question. Probably no other political scientist or sociologist has held to the line of Marxist theory and political class analysis as well and as firmly as James Petras, scholar and revolutionary extraordinaire.

HENRY VELTMAYER

References

- Petras, James and Henry Veltmeyer. 2001. *Globalization Unmasked: Imperialism in the 21st Century*. London: Zed Books.
- Petras, James and Henry Veltmeyer. 2003. *System in Crisis*. London and Halifax: Zed Books and Fernwood Publications.
- Petras, James and Henry Veltmeyer. 2005. *Social Movements and State Power*. London: Pluto Press.
- Petras, James and Henry Veltmeyer. 2005. *Empire with Imperialism*. London and Halifax: Zed Books and Fernwood Publications.
- Petras, James and Henry Veltmeyer. 2007. *Multinationals on Trial*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.
- Petras, James and Henry Veltmeyer. 2017. *Class Struggle in Latin America: Making History Today*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Petras, James and Henry Veltmeyer. 2018. *Imperialism and Capitalism in the 21st Century*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Veltmeyer, Henry. 2010. "James Petras, Scholar and Revolutionary: An Appreciation." *Critical Sociology* 35, no. 6 (November): 705–18.
- Veltmeyer, Henry and James Petras. 2014. *The New Extractivism: A Model for Latin America or the New Imperialism?* London: Zed Books.

See also

Theories of Imperialism; Dependency Theory

217. Piven, Frances Fox

Frances Fox Piven is an internationally known social scientist who has made critical intellectual contributions to our understanding of welfare policy, social movements, and elections. She is equally significant for the important role she has played in supporting people's movements for justice, and promoting policy change. She is among the 100 most cited political scientists in the United States (Kim and Grofman 2019). She authored or co-authored 15 books, many of them with her husband and collaborator, Richard Cloward, and published more than 200 articles in both scholarly journals and popular publications (CUNY Grad Center). She co-founded the National Welfare Rights Organization in the 1960s, and Human Service Employees Registration and Voter Education Campaign (Human SERVE), an organization dedicated to equalizing access to the vote, in 1982, and has served on the boards of many other advocacy organizations.

Piven was born in Calgary, Alberta, on October 10, 1932. She enrolled at the University of Chicago at the age of 15, where she earned her B.A., an M.A. in City Planning and a Ph.D. in Social Science (1962). She was on the faculty of the Columbia University School of Social Work for six years, and at Boston University for ten years, before joining the faculty of the Graduate Center of the City University of New York in 1982 (Piven with Milkman 2016). She was named Distinguished Professor of Political Science and Sociology in 1988, and taught there until her retirement.

Her 1971 book, *Regulating the Poor: The Functions of Public Welfare*, written with Cloward, challenged the common notion that governments expanded welfare programs when the need was greatest. By close examination of the historical record, Piven and Cloward argued that governments expand social welfare programs when economic dislocations threaten the social order. As conditions change, welfare programs are restricted to ensure that people will be willing to take any job at any wage rather than seek welfare. The book attracted both popular and scholarly attention and debate, as did several of their later works.

Through working with poor people through Mobilization for Youth and supporting tenant

movements in Harlem, Piven developed her signature argument that poor and disenfranchised people protest in disruptive ways because the most effective power they have is to the power to disrupt. She first published this argument in an article entitled "Low-income People and the Political Process," which she wrote for a training program at Mobilization for Youth and later published (Piven 1965, Piven with Milkman 2016, 39). She helped to found the National Welfare Rights Organization, and she and Cloward developed a strategy to force improvements in the welfare system by encouraging large numbers of eligible people to apply for welfare grants. Their efforts ended many unfair local welfare agency policies and led to the creation of the Supplemental Security Income program.

This work also led Piven and Cloward to the further development of the disruption thesis, which they published as *Poor People's Movements: Why They Succeed, How They Fail* (1977). In this groundbreaking book, they argue that the ability of poor people's movements to win is shaped by the social and political context in which they find themselves; their greatest tool for exercising power is their power to disrupt, not the building of conventional organizations. Their argument offered an important correction to the resource mobilization theory that then dominated studies of social movements and sober advice to activists committed to the Alinsky model of building power through permanent organization.

Through their work with anti-poverty organizations like ACORN and Project Vote!, Piven and Cloward were involved in efforts to register poor people in the 1984 election cycle. They tried to persuade social service agencies and social workers to register their clients and encourage them to vote. They hoped that registering the welfare recipients and low-income working people who were most harmed by the Reagan Administration could affect the outcome of the election. Although it did not, the experience demonstrated for them the resistance to a fully inclusive electorate as they explained in *Why Americans Don't Vote*, 1988 (reissued in 2000 as *Why Americans Don't Vote and Why Politicians Want it That Way*).

After the 1984 election, Piven and Cloward shifted the attention of the organization they had founded, Human SERVE, to advocating legislation to make it easier to

register to vote. They pushed in particular for agency-based voter registration – requiring government agencies to integrate voter registration into their application processes. Nearly a decade later, Piven and Cloward stood behind President Bill Clinton as he signed the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 into law, which required most states to offer voter registration by mail, in motor vehicle agencies, and in agencies serving the poor and disabled.

Piven expected resistance to the NVRA and resistance there was. Two states sued the US Government, claiming the NVRA was unconstitutional, and six other states had to be sued to force them to implement the law. Many states dragged their feet, particularly on offering registration in public assistance and disability agencies. Over the following decades, Piven continued to push for full implementation of the law and to call out the resistance as a tactic to demobilize voters. In a 2009 book she co-authored, Piven argued that we too often pay attention only to the mobilizing efforts of parties, and fail to fully recognize the incentives for parties to demobilize inconvenient voters (Piven, Minnite and Groarke, 2009).

When ACORN was destroyed by the malicious attacks of Project Veritas, Piven joined the board of Project Vote! which worked closely with ACORN on voter registration to help the organization survive. Over the next several years, Project Vote! engaged in research, litigation, legislative work, and technical assistance to groups doing voter registration to equalize access to the vote.

When Bill Clinton proposed to “end welfare as we know it,” Piven mobilized feminists to defend social supports for America’s poorest families. With her encouragement, NOW hired Faith Evans, a welfare rights activist, as their point person on the issue. Piven wrote and spoke publicly and on TV in opposition to the punitive changes to the

welfare system which passed Congress with bipartisan support in 1996.

Throughout her career, Piven has been an inspiring teacher and a supportive mentor to countless students, shepherding many through dissertations and into productive careers as scholars, researchers, teachers and activists. She has won numerous lifetime achievement awards, for her scholarship, her mentorship, and her work on behalf of social justice.

MARGARET GROARKE

References

- CUNY Graduate Center. “Frances Fox Piven.” <https://politicalscience.commons.gc.cuny.edu/faculty/frances-fox-piven/>.
- Kim, Hannah June and Bernard Grofman. 2019. “The Political Science 400: With Citation Counts by Cohort, Gender, and Subfield.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 52, no. 2 (April): 296–311.
- Piven, Frances Fox. 1965. “Low Income People and the Political Process.” In *The Politics of Turmoil: Essays on Poverty, Race, and the Urban Crisis*, edited by Richard A. Cloward and Frances Fox Piven, 73–88. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Piven, Frances Fox and Richard A. Cloward. 1977. *Poor People’s Movements: Why they Succeed, How They Fail*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Piven, Frances Fox and Richard A. Cloward. 2000. *Why Americans Don’t Vote and Why Politicians Want It That Way*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Piven, Frances Fox with Ruth Milkman. 2016. *Frances Fox Piven: Scholar and Activist*. Washington DC: American Sociological Association.
- Piven Frances Fox, Lorraine Minnite and Margaret Groarke. 2009. *Keeping Down the Black Vote: Race and the Demobilization of American Voters*. New York: New Press.

See also

Richard A. Cloward; Poverty; Social Movement Analysis

218. Polanyi, Karl

Karl Polanyi (October 25, 1886–April 23, 1964), the brother of philosopher of science Michael Polanyi, was raised in Budapest during the height of the nineteenth-century liberal economic system and the international gold standard. He was trained as a lawyer at Budapest University and was awarded a doctorate in law in 1912. He left for Vienna, the capital of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, to work as senior editor of *Der Österreichische Volkswirt* (*The Austrian Economist*) just as the liberal global order was on the verge of collapse. His work is an attempt to understand this systemic demise and its aftermath. Polanyi fled to England in 1933 as he feared retribution for his anti-fascist views (Block and Somers 2014, 5). After the war, he relocated to Columbia University where he taught economic history and made major contributions toward a *substantive* approach to economic anthropology that rejected the formalism and economic fallacies of more mainstream theorists (see Polanyi 1966).

The centerpiece of Karl Polanyi's ideas is encapsulated in *The Great Transformation*, which attempted to understand the crises of the 1930s as the outgrowth of the unraveling of the utopian liberal global system of the Nineteenth Century – market society. What Polanyi adds to critical analysis is the rejection of the automaticity of markets, the belief that they are natural – the outcome of the spontaneous unfolding human nature, that they are self-regulating, and that all of society can be organized and ruled by markets. In most societies, according to Polanyi, the economy is subordinate, embedded in social relations and obligations. Polanyi argues, “No society could, naturally, live for any length of time unless it possessed an economy of some sort; but previously to our time no economy has ever existed that, even in principle, was controlled by markets” (Polanyi 2001, 45). The nineteenth-century liberal system, centered on the idea of a self-regulating market, “implied a stark utopia” that if allowed to exist for an extended time would annihilate “the human and natural substance of society” that would be subjected to this automatic mechanism (Polanyi 2001, 3).

The liberal system of self-regulating markets requires a separation of the political and economic spheres. In such a system,

the role of society and the economic system based on markets was inverted in a manner that contrasted with all previous social relations. In essence, all elements of industry – capital, land, labor, and money – must be priced in the market economy. This becomes “One Big Market” (Polanyi 2001, 75). To do this, land, labor, and money must be organized into markets and viewed by the economy as commodities; however, as Polanyi argues, they are obviously not commodities in that they were not produced for sale. This is his concept of *fictitious commodities* that support the myth of the self-adjusting market.

Polanyi provides an ethical critique of market society as producing a flawed conception of humans that harms their development and creates a society of fear (Polanyi 2000, 140). Humans have a nature not tied to specific motives but to their functionality as social beings. Polanyi calls into question the individualistic psychological basis for human action and the timeless, omni-geographic traits such as the propensity to truck and barter. He argues, “For once society expects a definite behavior on the part of its members, and prevailing institutions become roughly capable of enforcing that behavior, opinions on human nature will tend to mirror the ideal whether it resembles actuality or not” (Polanyi 2000, 145).

The result of the total adherence to market fluctuations was a kind of society that led to widespread dislocation and cultural ruin. As the implications of this society became clear to various groups, a *countermovement* comprised of spontaneous attempts at protection arose. Polanyi's account reverses liberal interpretations that posit an unplanned rise of market society and a coordinated, even conspiratorial collectivist and anti-liberal response: “Laissez-faire was planned; planning was not” (Polanyi 2001, 147).

Polanyi argued that institutional development was characterized by a dialectic, the *double movement*. The first movement, economic improvement, is the movement toward a free market economy. Because this is ultimately an endeavor to disembed the economy from the social system, an impossible goal, the movement gives rise to a countermovement that resists this process. This second movement protects *habitation*, the livability of the commoner. As an activist government created a *laissez-faire* economy based on the self-adjusting market and the commod-

ity fictions, a counter movement spontaneously emerged to protect society from the ravages of such a system. This countermovement created problems by interfering with the self-adjusting mechanism of the market, resulting in catastrophic effects. The protective movement, however, did not solve the problems of the disembedded economy. At the global and national levels, a series of contradictions between protection and the self-regulating market surfaced. This movement could also be decidedly anti-liberal. Polanyi argues, "In order to comprehend German fascism, we must revert to Ricardian England" (Polanyi 2001, 32). The ensuing cataclysm and the restructuring of society culminated in what Polanyi calls "The Great Transformation."

For critical theorists, Polanyi's analysis might be found wanting in two areas: his treatment of class, and his optimistic view of institutional change. First, for Polanyi, class interest is an insufficient explanation for long-term social change. His basic argument is that such a theory does not explain why certain classes would come to each other's defense, as in the case of protectionism (Polanyi 2001, 160). The causality between classes and society is reversed in Polanyi's analysis: "The fate of classes is more frequently determined by the needs of society than the fate of society is determined by the needs of classes" (Polanyi 2001, 159). Second, institutional development for Polanyi is discontinuous and irreversible, with complete and revolutionary transitions and thus is unable to account for the neoliberal resurgence and resilience.

The recurring crises of neoliberalism and the rise of populism have led heterodox political economists to reengage with Polanyi's ideas as a means of understanding contemporary events with entries into *New Political Science* and the *Journal of Economic Issues* and extended reassessments of the continuing significance of Polanyian analyses by Mark Blyth, Gareth Dale, Kari Polanyi Levitt, Fred Block and Margaret Somers, and others.

DAVID J. PLANTE

References

- Block, Fred and Margaret Somers. 2014. *The Power of Market Fundamentalism: Karl Polanyi's Critique*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Blyth, Mark. 2002. *Great Transformations: Economic Ideas and Institutional Change in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dale, Gareth. 2010. *Karl Polanyi: The Limits of the Market*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Levitt, Kari Polanyi. 2013. *On Karl Polanyi and Other Essays: From the Great Transformation to the Great Financialization*. New York: Zed Books.
- Polanyi, Karl. 1966. *Dohomey and the Slave Trade: An Analysis of an Archaic Economy*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Polanyi, Karl. 2000. "Our Obsolete Market Mentality." *Transformations in Capitalism: Economy, Society, and the State in Modern Times*, ed. Harry F. Dahms, 137–50. Washington Square, New York: New York University Press.
- Polanyi, Karl. 2001. *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*, 2nd edn. Boston: Beacon Books.

219. Poulantzas, Nicos

Nicos Poulantzas (b. Athens, September 21, 1936–d. Paris, October 3, 1979) is a standard reference in studies on the Marxist theory of the capitalist state. Nicos Poulantzas first rose to prominence as a Marxist political theorist in France with the publication of *Pouvoir Politique et Classes Sociales* (1978 [1968]), which appeared only a few days before the May Days of 1968 (Jessop 1985, 9–25). However, following a review of Ralph Miliband's *The State in Capitalist Society* (1969) in the *New Left Review*, Poulantzas' work soon captured world-wide scholarly attention. The scholarly and political interest in his book on state theory quickly resulted in Spanish (1972) and English (1973) language translations and, by the mid-1970s, Goran Therborn (1987, 1230) observes that "Nicos Poulantzas was arguably the most influential living political theorist in the world." In a remarkably short period of time, Poulantzas' book was influencing left-wing academics and political activists throughout Europe, North America, Latin America, and beyond. Thus, Bob Jessop (1985, 5–6), who has written the most extensive intellectual biography of Poulantzas suggests "it is no exaggeration to claim that Poulantzas remains the single most important and influential Marxist theorist of the state and politics in the post-war period."

Poulantzas' intellectual legacy unfolded between the mid-1960s through the 1970s. He was Professor of Sociology at the University of Paris VIII (Vincennes-Saint Denis). During his life, Poulantzas published *Political Power and Social Classes* (1978 [1968]), *Fascism and Dictatorship* (1974 [1970]), *Classes in Contemporary Capitalism* [1974], *The Crisis of the Dictatorships* (1976b), and *State, Power, Socialism* (1980). From his early writings on law to his later interventions on socialism and democracy, Poulantzas addressed crucial questions within Marxist political theory (Jessop 1991), such as the relation between the State and social classes, the rise of authoritarian statism, the links between national and international processes of production, the problem of imperialism, and strategies for a transition to socialism. As Jessop points out (1985), Poulantzas' thought originates in three sources (apart from the classics of Marxism): French phi-

losophy (i.e., Jean-Paul Sartre's existentialism, Louis Althusser's structuralism, and Michel Foucault's micropolitics), Italian politics (Antonio Gramsci and, later, Pietro Ingrao's left Eurocommunist tendency), and Romano-German law (especially, the works of Hans Kelsen).

Poulantzas is primarily known in the Anglo-Saxon academy for his debate with Ralph Miliband (1969, 1970, 1973, 1976a) in the *New Left Review* on Marxist methodology and the nature of the capitalist state (Barrow 2002). Among his most original contributions to this debate was his concept of the *relative autonomy of the State*, which refers to the complex and variable field of class struggle in each social formation, where the state's "function" is to organize the capitalist class and disorganize the working class. In performing this function, the State cannot identify itself with the ruling class or with specific fractions of that class, because it must often adopt policies that subordinate the interests of specific capitalist class fractions to promote the interests of the capitalist class as a whole. Thus, the State is neither directly an instrument of class domination nor a neutral arbiter of the class struggle and political hegemony. On the other hand, Poulantzas suggests the concept of a *power bloc*, which points to the type of mediation produced by the State to unify (in an unstable balance of compromises) the contradictory interests of the different classes and dominant fractions within it, under the hegemony of one of them. In this respect, Poulantzas proposes a *theory of the State as a social relation* or, as Jessop (1991, 95), puts it, as "an institutionally mediated expression of the changing balance of forces."

Poulantzas (1980) explains that the State is neither a thing nor a subject, but the material condensation of the contradictory relationship between ruling classes and dominated classes. By adopting this strategic-relational approach (Jessop 1990), Poulantzas rejected a general theory of the State in favor of a concrete and situated analysis of actually existing capitalist states. Challenged by the political urgencies of his time, Poulantzas translated into sophisticated theoretical terms the strategic debates of the European left. Therefore, his changing views of the State and political strategy can only be understood considering his involvements in Greek and French politics. He was a member of

the Greek Communist Party. Poulantzas' reflections on the link between socialism and democracy develop an unexplored point in its strategic and theoretical dimension, which is that of the relations between the left and State institutions in democratic societies. His final political position consisted of the double combination of struggles directed at the State and those "at a distance" from it, and of forms of representative and direct democracy. This represented a break with respect to the traditional strategies of the Left: either the Leninist revolutionary strategy, or the reformist strategy of the social democracy (Barrow 2023).

JACINTA GORRITI

References

- Barrow, Clyde W. 2002. "The Miliband-Poulantzas Debate: An Intellectual History." In *Paradigm Lost: Revising State Theory*, edited by Stanley Aronowitz and Peter Bratsis. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 2023. "Nicos Poulantzas Was a Vital Theorist of Democratic Socialism." *The Jacobin*, January 24. Available at Nicos Poulantzas Was a Vital Theorist of Democratic Socialism (jacobin.com).
- Jessop, Bob. 1985. *Nicos Poulantzas: An Intellectual Biography*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Jessop, Bob. 1990. *State Theory. Putting the Capitalist States in Their Place*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Jessop, Bob. 1991. "On the Originality, Legacy and Actuality of Nicos Poulantzas." *Studies in Political Economy* 34 (Spring): 107–75.
- Miliband, Ralph. 1970. "The Capitalist State: Reply to Nicos Poulantzas." *New Left Review* 59, no. 1: 53–60.
- Miliband, Ralph. 1973. "Poulantzas and the Capitalist State." *New Left Review* 82, no. 1: 83–93.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. 1969. "The Problem of the Capitalist State." *New Left Review* 58 (November/December): 67–78.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. 1974 [1970]. *Fascism and Dictatorship: The Third International and the Problem of Fascism*, translated from the French by Judith White. London: New Left Books.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. (1976a). "The Capitalist State: A Reply to Miliband and Laclau." *New Left Review* 95 (January/February): 63–83.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. 1976b. *Crisis of the Dictatorships*. London: Verso.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. 1978 [1968]. *Political Power and Social Classes*. London: Verso.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. 1980. *State, Power, Socialism*. New York: Verso.
- Therborn, Goran. 1987. "Review of Nicos Poulantzas: *Marxist Theory and Political Strategy*, by Bob Jessop." *American Journal of Sociology* 92: 1230–3.

See also

Marxism (Structural-Functional); Theories of the State; Socialism; Louis Althusser; Clyde W. Barrow; Bob Jessop; Ralph Miliband; Leo Panitch

220. Reed, Jr., Adolph L.

Adolph L. Reed, Jr. (b. January 14, 1947–) is Professor Emeritus of Political Science at the University of Pennsylvania. Reed rose to prominence as a critical political scientist specializing in the problems of race and racism in American politics. Reed was born in the Bronx, New York, although he grew up in New Orleans, Louisiana, where he experienced first-hand the effects of Jim Crow in the South. His father was a founder of the National Conference of Black Political Scientists, a member of the American Labor Party, and a delegate to the 1948 national convention of the Progressive Party, which nominated Henry A. Wallace as its U.S. Presidential candidate. Reed's mother was a social activist descended from Cuban immigrants (Reed, Jr. 2022).

Reed earned a B.A. from the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill (1971) and a Ph.D. in Political Science from Atlanta University (1981) (now Clark Atlanta University). During his graduate work, Reed taught at Howard University, Emory University, and Clark College. He was appointed to the faculty at Yale University in 1981, where he was promoted to Associate Professor in 1986 and to full Professor in 1988. Reed left Yale and subsequently taught at Northwestern University (1991–97), the University of Illinois at Chicago (1997–98) and the New School for Social Research (1998–2004) before finally settling at the University of Pennsylvania (2004–19) for the remainder of his career. Reed has served on the editorial boards of numerous left-wing scholarly journals, including *New Political Science*, *Socialist Register*, *New Labor Forum*, *nonsite*, *Dialectical Anthropology*, *Polity*, *International Labor and Working-Class History*, *Urban Affairs Review*, and *Telos*. Reed also served on the Executive Council of the American Political Science Association, the National Conference of Black Political Scientists, and the American Association of University Professors (Reed, Jr. 2016).

Reed's earliest intellectual influence was Marxism and he self-identified as a Marxist at the age of 13, but later in his youth he was also influenced by Frankfurt School, particularly Herbert Marcuse, Georg Lukács, and Jürgen Habermas (Reed, Jr. 1984). However, Reed was always an engaged scholar, who

made frequent forays into politics. For instance, in 1996, he was a co-founder of the U.S. Labor Party and played a role in drafting its platform with support from several national labor unions (Dudzic and Isaac 2016). Reed was also a close advisor and campaigner for Senator Bernie Sanders' U.S. Presidential campaigns in 2016 and 2020. Reed has long been a critic of "identity politics," emphasizing instead the importance of trade union organizing and building an intersectional labor party that will represent the full range of interests of the U.S. working class (Wallace-Wells 2022). Reed has consistently drawn attention to the absence of class-based analyses in U.S. academic discourse and practical politics. He is often found quoting Karl Marx's 10th Thesis on Feuerbach that "The philosophers have only *interpreted* the world, in various ways; the point, however, is to change it."

Reed (1997, 1986, 2016) is a prolific writer, who has published critical treatises on the political thought of W.E.B. DuBois, Jesse Jackson's 1984 U.S. Presidential campaign, and the material foundations of African-American political thought. Reed's critical analyses in these books highlight a key message of most of his life's work, which is that our collective political lens tends to spotlight Black political figures in a disingenuous and artificially heroic and yet dehumanizing light that ultimately essentializes and reifies race for its own sake. This is done at the expense of actionable socio-political and class-based political consciousness that might inform and ameliorate the material conditions of the vast majority of people. Reed has carried this message into the public forum by contributing many essays to newspapers, blogs, while also serving as a regular columnist for periodicals such as *The Nation*, *The Village Voice*, and *The Progressive*. Reed has never shrunk from controversy and he is well-known as a formidable polemicist, including debates with William Julius Wilson on the "culture of poverty," and public disagreements with Cornel West, Henry Louis Gates, and Barack Obama. Reed's overall critique is not necessarily a "class-based" argument as opposed to a "race-based" argument. Rather, he has criticized a version of this supposed dichotomy as it has been practiced by Democratic party moderates from the Kennedys to the Clintons (Dudzic and Reed, Jr. 2014).

However, Reed's sharpest words are reserved for those public officials and media influencers, who aid and accommodate the powerful economic actors whose self-aggrandizing imperatives drive governmental and social priorities. Donald Trump, the real estate industry, and the Silicon Valley tech billionaires have all been targets of his analysis, as have been many members of organized labor, the modern socialist movement, Hollywood celebrities, and Democratic Party officeholders. As Reed wrote in the titular essay of his 1999 book, *Stirrings in the Jug*: "Politics can be created only by going to basics and building it "from the bottom up."

DANIEL T. KIRSCH

References

- Dudzic, Mark and Adolph L. Reed, Jr. 2014. "The Crisis of Labour and the Left." In *Socialist Register: Transforming Classes*, edited by Leo Panitch and Gregory Albo, 351–75. London: Merlin Press.
- Dudzic, Mark and Katherine Isaac. 2016. "Labor Party Time? Not Yet." In *Empowering Progressive Third Parties in the United States: Defeating Duopoly, Advancing Democracy*, edited by Jonathan H. Martin, 166–83. New York: Routledge.
- Reed, Jr., Adolph L. 1984. "Paths to Critical Theory." *Social Text*, no. 9/10: 254–8.
- Reed, Jr., Adolph L. 1986. *The Jesse Jackson Phenomenon: The Crisis of Purpose in Afro-American Politics*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Reed, Jr., Adolph L. 1997. *W.E.B. DuBois and American Political Thought: Fabianism and the Color Line*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reed, Jr., Adolph L. 1999. *Stirrings in the Jug: Black Politics in the Post-Segregation Era*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Reed, Jr., Adolph L. 2016. "Curriculum Vita, April 2." Available at Reed Vitae (upenn.edu). Accessed April 6, 2023.
- Reed, Jr. Adolph L. 2022. *The South: Jim Crow and Its Afterlives*. London: Verso Books.
- Reed, Jr., Adolph L., Kenneth W Warren, and Madhu Dubey. 2016. *Renewing Black Intellectual History: The Ideological and Material Foundations of African American Thought*. London: Routledge.
- Wallace-Wells, Benjamin. 2022. "The Marxist Who Antagonizes Liberals and the Left: The Renowned Black Scholar Adolph Reed Opposes the Politics of Anti-Racism, Describing It as a Cover for Capitalism." *The New Yorker*, January 31.

221. Reinaga, Fausto

Fausto Reinaga (b. March 27, 1906–d. August 19, 1994) was a Bolivian indigenous intellectual, writer, and political activist. His writings provided an intellectual platform for the anti-colonial and anti-Occident philosophy and political practice known as *indianismo*, which emerged in Bolivia and Peru in the 1960s and 1970s. His books and activism provided a sharp challenge to the ideas that had legitimized internal colonial structures in post-independence Latin American nations, which for Bolivia, Reinaga argued, meant the continued subjugation of indigenous majorities by Eurodescent and mixed-blood (*mestizo*) elites.

Reinaga was born in 1906 to rural parents in Macha (Bolivia), near Potosí, the historical site of massive silver extraction during early Spanish colonial rule, and the site of the Great Andean Rebellion against the Spanish in the 1780s. Reinaga's thinking and activism were closely connected to Bolivia's larger revolutionary genealogy, and he claimed to be a descendant on his mother's side of Tomás Katari, a leader of the 1780s rebellion (Goodale 2019, 218). As a child, he worked in mining and agriculture and did not attend school until age 16, when he learned to read and write Spanish. Eventually, Reinaga moved to Sucre where he worked as a philosophy teacher and completed a law degree at the Universidad Mayor Real y Pontificia San Francisco Xavier de Chuquisaca in 1936 (Kearney 2014, 69–70).

Reinaga went on to become a prolific writer of 32 books and essays. He was persecuted, tortured, and arrested several times throughout his life because of his political activism (Reinaga 2012), and his books were banned for decades in Bolivia. He founded the Partido Indio de Bolivia, the country's first indigenous political party. He died in La Paz, Bolivia in 1994.

Reinaga became a Marxist in the 1930s, and later joined the Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario (MNR), the left-leaning political party that was one of the main forces behind reforms brought about by the 1952 National Revolution such as agrarian reform, nationalization of mines and industry, universal public education, and the assimilation of indigenous people into the country's social and political life as "peasants"

(instead of "Indians") on the basis of class rather than culture or race. He later became disillusioned with corruption in the MNR and left to attend the 1957 Fourth World Trade Union Congress in Leipzig (Goodale 2019, 219). He moved to the Soviet Union for three years. Once back in Bolivia, and influenced by contemporary thinkers such as Frantz Fanon and Malcolm X (Lucero 2008; Cruz 2015), as well as Marxist indigenous thinkers such as Constantino Lima (Delgado Mancilla 2017, 53), his writings argued for an anti-colonial re-reading of Bolivia's past and present from an indigenous perspective ("for and by the Indians") in order to transcend the leading ideology that, despite the renewed nation-making projects of the 20th century, continued to place Indianness as an inferior and outdated condition and kept Indians as slaves (Reinaga 1970, 59).

Indianismo's ideology is best represented in his three consecutive volumes *La Revolución India* (1970), *Manifiesto del Partido Indio de Bolivia* (1970), and *Tesis India* (1971). A central idea in these books is that the liberation of Bolivia's majority indigenous population "depended on ideological autonomy" (Goodale 2019, 223). From independence (1825) through to revolutionary nationalism (1952) and beyond, the colonial segregation of Spaniards and Indians had not changed in the hands of republican mestizo elites according to Reinaga. Instead, the latter "redoubled the oppressive enslavement of Indians" (Goodale 2019, 155).

Reinaga denounced the failings of twentieth-century assimilationist nation-making projects: "For the [Bolivian] Indian, the 'national problem' is this: Half a million *cholos* [mixed blood Bolivians] oppress four million Indians" (Reinaga 1970, 153). He argued that nation-statehood for Bolivia was nothing more than an abstraction, "a committee that administers the interests of the 'blond beasts' of the Occident" (Reinaga 1970, 154), which had forcefully superimposed itself over an autochthonous community with superior history, territory, culture, and political norms (Reinaga 1970, 153), and which needed to be overcome through radical political action.

Despite his central focus on race, Reinaga's main argument was against cultural assimilation and the resulting economic and political oppression of indigenous people. Reinaga argued for the superiority of indigenous cul-

tures and practices over Western corruption. In 1962, Reinaga formed the indianist Partido de Indios Aymaras y Keswas party, which later changed its name to the Partido Indio de Bolivia (Cruz 2015, 37) to act on the demands of an Indian protagonist and incorporate pre-Conquest Andean social and political structures “as a basis for constructing socialism” (Escárzaga 2012, quoted by Kearney 2014, 79). Reinaga’s rhetoric and ideas influenced generations of radical indigenous leaders in Bolivia and Latin America. *La Revolución India (The Indian Revolution)* has been cited as a catalyst for the movements that led to the first Aymara Indian president of Bolivia (Evo Morales) in 2006 (Lucero 2008).

XIMENA CORDOVA

References

- Cruz, Gustavo. 2015. “Poder indio y poder negro: recepciones del pensamiento negro en Fausto Reinaga”. In *Iconos. Revista de Ciencias Sociales* 51: 29–46.
- Delgado Mancilla, Abraham. 2017. “Constitución del indio y lo indio.” In *Pensamiento político aymara y la descolonización de la memoria, 1960–2017*, edited by Abraham Delgado Mancilla, Abraham and Sinclair Thompson, 47–68. La Paz, Bolivia: Jorval Ediciones.
- Escárzaga, Fabiola. 2015. “Fausto Reinaga, el indio y los caudillos militares en Bolivia.” In *Meridional: Revista Chilena de Estudios Lationamericanos* 4: 143–71.
- Goodale, Mark. 2019. *A Revolution in Fragments: Traversing Scales of Justice, Ideology, and Practice in Bolivia*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Kearney, Patrick. 2014. “Insurgent Legacy: Fausto Reinaga and the Indian Revolution.” Master’s Thesis, University of California, San Diego. Available at <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2pt2m7v4>.
- Lucero, Jose Antonio. 2008. “Fanon in the Andes: Fausto Reinaga, Indianismo and the Black Atlantic.” *International Journal of Critical Indigenous Issues* 1, no. 1: 13–22.
- Reinaga, Fausto. 2010 [1970]. *La Revolución India*. La Paz, Bolivia: La mirada salvaje.
- Reinaga, Fausto. 1970. *Manifiesto del partido indio de Bolivia*. La Paz, Bolivia: Ediciones PIB.
- Reinaga, Fausto. 2006 [1971]. *Tesis India*. La Paz, Bolivia: Hilda Reinaga.
- Reinaga, Hilda. 2012. *Biografía de Fausto Reinaga*. La Paz, Bolivia: Fundación Amautica Fausto Reinaga. Accessed July 24, 2021 <https://noracismo.gob.bo/archivos-pdf/homenaje-fausto-2013.pdf>.

Further readings

- Reinaga, Fausto. 1978. *El pensamiento amáutico*. La Paz, Bolivia: Author.
- Thomson, Sinclair, Rossana Barragán, Xavier Albó, Seemin Qayum, and Mark Goldberg, eds. 2018. *The Bolivia Reader: History, Culture, Politics*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Ticona, Esteban, ed. 2011. *Bolivia en el inicio del Pachakuti*. Madrid: Akal Ediciones.

222. Rensenbrink, John

John Rensenbrink (1928–2022) was born in Pease, Minnesota, one of seven children born to a family of Dutch immigrant dairy farmers. While operating the family's dairy farm, he took correspondence courses, which allowed him to attend Calvin College (1946–50) in Grand Rapids, Michigan, where he graduated with a B.A. degree. Rensenbrink earned a Master's degree in political science from the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor (1951) and, after accepting a Fulbright Scholarship to the University of Amsterdam (1951–52), he received a Ph.D. in political science (1956) from the University of Chicago with an emphasis on political philosophy, American politics, and U.S. Constitutional law.

Rensenbrink began his academic career at Coe College, but a year later he moved to Williams College (1957–61). In 1961, Rensenbrink moved to Bowdoin College to teach political philosophy and history. He remained at Bowdoin College until 1989, when he took early retirement to concentrate on organizing the Green Party.

Rensenbrink began his career as a member of the Republican Party but his disgust with the politics of Joseph McCarthy convinced him to join the Democratic Party. By 1968, however, Rensenbrink was disillusioned with the Democratic Party so he helped organize the Reform Democrats of Maine (1968 to 1970) for the purpose of ending the Vietnam War and democratizing the Democratic Party. Later, while visiting Poland in 1983, Rensenbrink learned of the West German Green Party and upon returning home he co-founded the Green Party of Maine along with Alan Philbrook, a fellow anti-nuclear activist. The following year (1984), Rensenbrink traveled the country to help organize the national Green Party. He was the Maine Green Party's candidate for U.S. Senate in 1996 and captured 4% of the votes in that election.

Rensenbrink is best known for his books on green politics and ecology, including *The Greens and the Politics of Transformation* (1992), *Against All Odds, the Green Transformation of American Politics* (1999), *Ecological Politics: For Survival and Democracy* (2017), and an autobiographical memoir, *Encounters with the Improbable*

(2021). In his memoir, Rensenbrink traces the beginnings of his ecological thought to the late 1960s, when he was teaching the political theories of Thomas Hobbes and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Rensenbrink began questioning the classical liberal conception of nature as a nasty and brutish competition among isolated individuals seeking to control nature. He began to articulate an alternative philosophy of nature during the 1970s and in *Ecological Politics* (2017) he argued that an ecological politics was key to the survival of the human species and the Earth. He called upon the Green Parties of the world to unite in a common vision of deep ecology based on a new ontology that rejected the separation of humans from nature.

During his academic career, Rensenbrink was a prominent figure in the Caucus for a New Political Science (CNPS). Rensenbrink was twice elected Chair of the CNPS (1974–76). He traveled tirelessly to regional political science meetings to promote the growth of CNPS. His efforts attracted a new generation of graduate students and young faculty to the Caucus. Rensenbrink's organizational efforts set the stage for what he described as "a socialist takeover" of the CNPS at its September 1978 business meeting in New York City. Rensenbrink led a coalition of Marxist humanists, feminist socialists, decentralist ecologists, and participatory democrats that shifted CNPS leadership from an older generation of disenchanted liberals to a younger generation of radicals. Rensenbrink also supported a new initiative to found a Caucus flagship journal, *New Political Science: A Journal of Politics and Culture*. He chaired the journal's editorial board from its founding in 1979 to 1981, and remained a member of the board until 1986.

By the early 1980s, Rensenbrink (1982, 94–5) lamented that it was becoming "fashionable to downplay the critical importance of class" in comparison to gender, race, and ethnicity as Marxism gave way to the identity politics of post-structuralism, post-modernism, and post-colonialism. Yet, for this reason, Rensenbrink considered it necessary for the Caucus "to embrace the powerful critique and creative philosophic and scholarly energy of the feminist movement" (Lankowski 1981, 101). He (1982, 95) advised the Caucus to be more open to the issues raised by Black and other Third

World struggles and the emerging ecological critique of capitalism.

Rensenbrink (1982, 95) identified another “deeper problem” in the Caucus, which was the emergence of two wings that co-existed uneasily in a common commitment to socialism. An intellectual wing was “more closely tied to conceptions and habits of professional work within the discipline, and to professional expectations,” while an activist wing included political activists who were “more critical of the ‘professional’ side of the profession.” Rensenbrink considered both wings of the Caucus important to its continued vitality, but because Caucus business meetings were held during the APSA conference, it was the intellectual wing that was becoming preponderant in Caucus decision-making. He feared that a hegemony of the pure intellectuals would make the CNPS less dynamic and the Caucus might cease “to be the hard-hitting organization it should and can be” (Rensenbrink 1982, 95). During the latter part of his academic career, Rensenbrink was a driving force in the movement to create an NPS Organized Section of the American Political Science Association and, during this time, he began

calling for a return to the organizational activism of the 1960s and 1970s.

CLYDE W. BARROW

References

- Barrow, Clyde W. 2022. “John Rensenbrink, 1945–2020 In Memoriam.” *New Political Science* 44, no. 3 (September): 1–6.
- Lankowski, Carl. 1981. “Report to the Membership, January 1981.” *New Political Science* 2 (1–2): 99–110.
- Rensenbrink, John. 1982. “Should the Caucus Form an Organized Section?” *PS* 15, no. 4 (Autumn): 569–70.
- Rensenbrink, John. 1982. “CNPS and NPS: Pitfalls and Prospects.” *New Political Science* 2 (4): 93–8.
- Rensenbrink, John. 1992. *The Greens and the Politics of Transformation*. San Pedro, CA: R&E Miles Publishers.
- Rensenbrink, John, and Ralph Nader. 1999. *Against All Odds, the Green Transformation of American Politics*. Raymond, Maine: Leopold Press.
- Rensenbrink, John. 2017. *Ecological Politics: For Survival and Democracy*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Rensenbrink, John. 2021. *Encounters with the Improbable*. Independently Published.

223. Robinson, Cedric J.

Cedric James Robinson (November 5, 1940–June 5, 2016) was born in Alabama, but he grew up in Oakland, California. He earned a B.A. in Social Anthropology (1963) at the University of California, Berkeley. While a student at Berkeley, Robinson became a political activist as a member of the Afro-American Association, a student study group that explored issues such as Black identity and African decolonization, among others. Robinson was drafted into the U.S. Army immediately after graduating from Berkeley. He subsequently enrolled at Stanford University, where he earned a Ph.D. (1974) in Political Theory. While completing his dissertation, Robinson was a lecturer in Political Science and Black Studies at the University of Michigan (1971–73), which was followed by a tenure-track position at Binghamton University–State University of New York (1973). In 1978, Robinson moved to the University of California, Santa Barbara as a Professor of Political Science, where he also served as Director of the Center for Black Studies Research.

Robinson published five books, as well as numerous articles and book chapters on the African diaspora and the portrayal of African-Americans in the news, film, and television (Robinson 2007). However, Robinson's greatest influence on critical political science was introducing both mainstream and critical scholars to ideas of a Black Radical Tradition and racial capitalism. Robinson first published *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition* in 1983, but it proved so influential it was republished in two more editions. *Black Marxism* (2020) was a critique of Marx's economic and political thought, which Robinson argues neglected to incorporate a wealth of extant nineteenth-century scholarship published by African-American and Black economists and radical political theorists (see also, Robinson 2019).

Not only did Robinson use this critical platform to introduce scholars to a neglected Black Radical Tradition extending from the seventeenth century to the present, he argued that Marx's neglect of this tradition meant that Marxists had failed to recognize that capitalism had always been racial capitalism.

Robinson argues that capitalism has always been structured by "racialism" from its origins in the primitive accumulation (Marx 2010 [1867], 704–64) that expropriated the resources and the bodies (slavery) of indigenous people of color in the New World, Africa, and Asia through colonial relations of exploitation and political domination.

Robinson's work has been highly influential among scholars and political activists in the United States. Robinson's book has influenced teaching and scholarship in African-American and Black Studies programs across the United States. This influence has slowly seeped into mainstream courses on the history of political thought and American political thought, which now frequently includes readings by W.E.B. DuBois and Martin Luther King. More recently, the Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement has defined the problem of Black oppression, and contemporary police violence against African-Americans through the lens of Robinson's concept of racial capitalism.

WILLIAM L. NIEMI

References

- Marx, Karl. 2010 [1867]. "Capital, Volume 1." In *Marx and Engels Collected Works*, 704–64. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Robinson, Cedric J. 2007. *Forgeries of Memory & Meaning: Blacks & the Regimes of Race in American Theater & Film Before World War II*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Robinson, Cedric J. 2019. *An Anthropology of Marxism*, 2nd edn. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Robinson, Cedric J. 2020. *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition*, 3rd edn. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Further readings

- Robinson, Cedric J. 1980. *Terms of Order: Political Science and the Myth of Leadership*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Robinson, Cedric J. 1997. *Black Movements in America*. New York: Routledge.

See also

- Critical Race Theory; W.E.B. DuBois; Black Marxism; Colonialism

224. Robinson, William I.

William I. Robinson (March 28, 1959–) is a Professor of Sociology and Global Studies at the University of California, Santa Barbara. Robinson began his career as a journalist, where he was an eyewitness to a significant change in the conduct, as distinct from the objectives, of U.S. foreign policy. Based in Nicaragua during the 1980s, he reported on the U.S.-sponsored “Contra war” that hobbled and ultimately defeated the Sandinista revolutionaries who had come to power in 1979. The nature of the defeat, however, was presented as a triumph of democracy that would allow the Nicaraguan people to have the final say on who governs. As Robinson (1992, 8) pointed out, the Contra war was part of a fundamental shift away from the Cold War interventionism that had orchestrated bloody coups d’état and installed repressive dictatorships. While the Sandinistas were ultimately forced to capitulate to “free” elections as the price of peace, authoritarian regimes in Chile, the Philippines, South Korea and apartheid South Africa, among others, were steered toward the adoption of liberal democratic norms.

Robinson studied journalism, political economy, and African politics at the University of Nairobi, Kenya (1977–78) and the University of Ibadan, Nigeria (1979). He earned a B.A. in Journalism at Friends World College (1981), followed by an M.A. in Latin American Studies (1992) and a Ph.D. in Sociology (1994) from the University of New Mexico. Robinson began his academic career as an Adjunct Professor of Sociology at the University of New Mexico (1994–96), an Assistant Professor at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville (1996–98) and New Mexico State University (1998–2001) before moving to U.C. Santa Barbara in 2001.

Robinson began to theorize his experiences in Nicaragua on a global scale in *Promoting Polyarchy* (1996), where he adopted Robert Dahl’s concept of institutionalized, carefully managed elite competition in regularized electoral contests, while applying Gramscian analysis to expose the means by which elites maintain hegemony and, more effectively than via dictatorship, maintain legitimacy. The role of the U.S. National Endowment for Democracy, established in 1983, is highlighted, as is its structure of interlocking

directorates as “an exact mirror of the institutional structure of power in the United States.” Subject to adaptation to local circumstances, this pattern is transposed such that “a string of civic, political, labor, and media organizations” whose “leadership is remarkably interlocking” and is “responsive to the concerns of their US mentors” to effectively establish neocolonial client states. Robinson (1996, 97) argued that “The goal is to construct a functioning oligarchic model of power and a polyarchic system which links local elites to the transnational elite.”

Robinson’s nascent theorization of transnational capitalist class formation and agency soon culminated in the publication of a book-length treatise (Robinson 2004). The reduction of democracy to Parsonian structural-functionalist process devoid of substantive content facilitated the replication and effective incorporation of local elites into transnational networks. Leslie Sklair’s (2001, 4) concept of “transnational practices” proved formative, but whereas Sklair’s particular focus on economic globalization and corporate agency distinguishes between “globalizing bureaucrats and politicians” who can be transnational, in contradistinction to the state, which “as such cannot” (Sklair 2001, 31 n3), Robinson (2004, 36 n1) argues that a transnational capitalist class has emerged coincident with capitalist accumulation on a global scale and that it employs various transnational governance mechanisms, staffed by functionaries and technicians, that comprise an embryonic transnational state apparatus. While far from fully formed, this class is representative of a “historical movement underway” (Robinson 2018, 228).

Robinson (2014, 5, 27) has refuted charges of doing away with the state, of ignoring uneven capitalist accumulation, of dismissing imperialism and especially that of the U.S. state, of propagating a Kautskyesque theory of “ultraimperialism,” and of overstating “the extent to which globalization has equalized the conditions for the production and exchange of value across space in the global system.” Among the more considered critiques of Robinson’s transnationalization thesis is that of Ronald Cox, who has proposed the alternative concept of transnational interest blocs. These are claimed to have originated in the political mobilization of transnationalizing corporations that sought to break free of the regulated, post-Second

World War Fordist regime of accumulation. These blocs, comprising corporate and state actors, vary with respect to cohesion and power, and while there remains a lack of explanatory empirical support for the claim regarding these blocs' fragility – the justification for their greater correspondence with reality – they allow for contingency such that the “direction of change” (Robinson 2018, 228) can itself more readily be observed to change (Cox 2019).

William Carroll (2010, 5) has followed Robinson in locating “the prime *agency* for economic globalization within the transnational capitalist class” but marshals empirical evidence mindful of earlier criticisms of Robinson's work as neglectful of national and regional dimensions. These criticisms appear to have been made without reference to Robinson's detailed empirical work focused on Latin America (Robinson 2003; 2008; see also Barahona 2011).

In recent years, Robinson's (2014) attention has increasingly focused on the breakdown of hegemony following the 2008 financial crisis (still unresolved) and the intensification of the mechanisms of mass social control in response to the loss of state legitimacy and associated vacuums in institutional power. Of particular concern has been the potential for a twenty-first-century form of fascism on a global scale to arise in response to “the breakdown of global capitalist hegemony” that has already “prompted the [transnational capitalist class] to impose a global police state” (Robinson 2020, 140; see also van der Pijl 2022).

MICHAEL KEANEY

References

- Barahona, Diana. 2011. “The Capitalist Globalization of Latin America.” *Critical Sociology* 37, no. 6: 889–95.
- Carroll, William J. 2010. *The Making of a Transnational Capitalist Class: Corporate Power in the 21st Century*. London: Zed Books.
- Cox, Ronald W. 2019. *Corporate Power, Class Conflict, and the Crisis of the New Globalization*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- “Curriculum Vita: William I. Robinson.” Available at https://robinson.faculty.soc.ucsb.edu/Assets/vitae/RESUME_7TH_PDF.pdf
- Robinson, William I. 1992. *A Faustian Bargain: U.S. Intervention in the Nicaraguan Elections and American Foreign Policy in the Post-Cold War Era*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Robinson, William I. 1996. *Promoting Polyarchy: Globalization, US Intervention, and Hegemony*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robinson, William I. 2003. *Transnational Conflicts: Central America, Social Change, and Globalization*. London: Verso.
- Robinson, William I. 2004. *A Theory of Global Capitalism: Production, Class, and State in a Transnational World*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Robinson, William I. 2008. *Latin America and Global Capitalism: A Critical Globalization Perspective*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Robinson, William I. 2014. *Global Capitalism and the Crisis of Humanity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robinson, William I. 2018. *Into the Tempest: Essays on the New Global Capitalism*. Chicago: Haymarket Books.
- Robinson, William I. 2020. *The Global Police State*. London: Pluto Press.
- Sklair, Leslie. 2001. *The Transnational Capitalist Class*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- van der Pijl, Kees. 2022. *States of Emergency: Keeping the Global Population in Check*. Atlanta, GA: Clarity Press.

225. Roelofs, H. Mark

Howard Mark Roelofs (October 25, 1923–August 17, 2008) was a co-founder of the Caucus for a New Political Science (CNPS), along with Christian Bay, who served as the organization's first Chairperson (1967–68). Roelofs was born in Stamford, Connecticut, the fourth of six children, and due to ill health he was home schooled during much of his childhood. As a child, Roelofs spent summers at Arden, his grandmother's East Aurora farm, which he purchased in 1989. Roelofs graduated from East Aurora High School in New York (1940).

He attended Amherst College before leaving in 1943 to enlist in the U.S. Navy, where he served as a communications officer on the admiral's staff and worked as an instructor at the Columbia University Midshipmen's School. He was a deputy naval expert at the Paris Peace Conference of 1946, where he negotiated the dissolution of the Italian Navy with his Russian counterpart. After his military service, Roelofs returned to Amherst College and graduated in 1947 with bachelor's degrees in physics and history. He was admitted to Balliol College, Oxford University, where he earned degrees in philosophy, politics, and economics.

Roelofs taught at Colgate University (1950–52) and Cornell University, where he became an assistant professor (1952–58). In 1958, he joined the faculty of New York University as an adjunct professor. Roelofs (2004) authored seven books, including *The Tension of Citizenship* (1957) and *The Language of Modern Politics* (1967), where he drew attention to the “distinction between America's mythic tradition of (Protestant) social democracy – by which we legitimize ourselves as a nation – and our ideological (bourgeois) tradition of liberal democracy – by which we organize ourselves for practical governance” (Roelofs 2004). His analysis of this tension in American politics led him to conclusions about the nation's future that he described as pessimistic. Roelofs (2004) argued that as Americans “we will endlessly hope – and as endlessly fail” because American politics is locked into an inescapable and repetitive cycle of a politics that fluctuates between utopian optimism and cynical despair. This contradiction between the ideal

and practice of American government was a recurring theme in all of his books (Marso et al. 2010).

However, the late 1960s was a period of mythic hope and unbridled utopian impulses. Roelofs was a political activist who opposed the Vietnam War and it was his anti-war activism that led to the founding of the Caucus for a New Political Science in 1967. Despite the political upheavals of the 1960s, the 1967 annual meeting of the American Political Science Association did not include a single session on the Vietnam War, urban riots, or the student and civil rights movements. In addition, APSA officials rejected or tabled several resolutions introduced by anti-war activists at the September 6, 1967 business meeting of the APSA in Chicago. The most contentious of these resolutions involved Article II of the APSA Constitution, which stated that the association “will not commit its members on questions of public policy nor take positions not immediately concerned with its direct purpose,” which is “to encourage the study of Political Science” (Barrow 2017). Article II was invoked by APSA officials to prevent the introduction of various “political” resolutions at the convention asking the APSA to take positions on contemporary public policy issues such as the Vietnam War. Within 36 hours, as anger spread through the convention participants, the CNPS emerged as a “spontaneous and wholly unpremeditated” event (Roelofs 1968, 38). The Caucus was organized in a series of three meetings, which culminated in the election of H. Mark Roelofs as the first CNPS chairman. Roelofs successfully organized a series of CNPS panels parallel to the 1968 APSA convention that dealt with topics such as whether the 1968 elections offered meaningful choices; race, power, and money; the creation of “news”; Vietnam and American foreign policy; and new modes of radical political thought and action in the United States.

Roelofs received many awards during his career, including three Best Teacher awards at NYU. In 2007, he received a special Lifetime Achievement Award from the Caucus for a New Political Science.

CLYDE W. BARROW

References

- Barrow, Clyde W. 2017. "The Political and Intellectual Origins of New Political Science." *New Political Science* 39, no. 4 (December): 437–72.
- Marso, Lori, Kathy E. Ferguson, Donald G. Tannenbaum, Patricia Moynagh, Ralph P. Hummel, and Marla Brettschneider. 2010. "A Symposium on the Political Thought of H. Mark Roelofs." *New Political Science* 32, no. 3 (September): 389–426.
- Roelofs, H. Mark. 1957. *The Tension of Citizenship: Private and Public Duty*. New York: Rinehart and Co., Inc.
- Roelofs, H. Mark. 1967. *The Language of Modern Politics: An Introduction to the Study of Government*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- Roelofs, H. Mark. 1968. "Communications: To the Editor." *PS* 1, no. 1 (Winter): 38–40.
- Roelofs, H. Mark. 2004. "Roelofs, H. Mark (1923–)." In *Contemporary Authors*. Farmington Hills, Michigan: Thomson Gale.

Further readings

- Roelofs, H. Mark. 1976. *Ideology and Myth in American Politics: A Critique of a National Political Mind*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co.
- Roelofs, H. Mark and Gerald L. Houseman. 1983. *American Political System: Ideology and Myth*. New York: Macmillan.
- Roelofs, H. Mark. 1992. *The Poverty of American Politics: A Theoretical Interpretation*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

226. Roelofs, Joan

Joan Roelofs (1936–present), an activist-scholar and eclectic ecosocialist, was born in New York City. She attended Cornell University, then Barnard College, where her specialty was constitutional law. Her senior honors thesis “The Right to Travel” covered Paul Robeson’s denial of a passport and the degraded status of migrant farm workers. As a graduate student at New York University, she sought to explore important issues that were rarely discussed in the mainstream media or in American universities.

Roelofs’ methodology is primarily historical, but she was influenced by Aristotle’s central question: “what is the good life and how can it be realized for all?” She also drew inspiration from Harold Lasswell’s question “Who gets what, when, and how?” which she interpreted to mean “who or what has power?” Thus, her perennial interest has always been in answering the question: “how are ideals promoted or thwarted by institutions?” Her M.A. thesis searched for political ideals in existentialism. Her doctoral dissertation, “The Theory and Non-Practice of British Socialism,” traced its goals and fortunes in the Labour Government of 1945–51. Roelofs taught at NYU from 1961–67.

At the 1967 meeting of the American Political Science Association, Roelofs attended the first meeting of the Caucus for a New Political Science, but did not actively participate in the organization until 1978, when she published an article on Marxism in the CNPS Newsletter, and chaired a CNPS panel, entitled “What is Political Science For?” Her article on Supreme Court and elites appeared in *Telos*, and she joined its editorial board.

In 1979 Roelofs began teaching at Keene State College, where she remained until she retired as a Full Professor in 2003. Her local public administration course inspired *Greening Cities: Building Just and Sustainable Communities* (1996). She was a union representative for workplace health and safety, and survived as a socialist in the college thanks to union review procedures.

She was an activist in the Green movement, locally in the Monadnock Greens, and nationally on the Green Party executive council in 1982. *Greening Cities* (1996) described local initiatives embodying the Greens’ 10

Key Values. The book was based on data collected in 1983 and 1984, some during a Fellowship at the Institute for Science and Technology Policy at Murdoch University (Fremantle, Australia). The book became a text in London, in an architectural college in Adelaide, Australia, and elsewhere. It earned her a medal from Middlebury College. She participated in the APSA section on Transformational and Ecological Politics, from which she received a Distinguished Career Award in 2002.

Roelofs’ research on elite values and the Supreme Court uncovered further evidence of the vast influence of foundations on local, national, and foreign policy. The results of this research were reported in various scholarly journals and in her book *Foundations and Public Policy: The Mask of Pluralism* (2003), which was influenced by the previous work of G. William Domhoff. She served as a board member of the Haymarket Peoples Fund, a progressive foundation that emerged from the radical protests of the 1960s.

As a member of the Union for Radical Political Economics, Roelofs helped to plan a 1982 conference in Burlington, Vermont to provide technical assistance to the new mayor Bernie Sanders. She led a workshop on democratizing local government. In the same year, Roelofs was a National Endowment for the Humanities summer seminar Fellow at the University of Virginia. The seminar was on “The Rise of the Centralized Society: From Progressivism to the New Deal,” led by history professor William Harbaugh. At the 1983 APSA meeting, Roelofs extended her research with a paper on “Foundation Influence on Supreme Court Decision-Making,” which was the one paper reported from the conference in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. She joined the Critical Legal Studies association, and in 1984 she was a guest speaker at Harvard Law School on “Foundations and the Judicial System.” Her work was identified as a “trend” in judicial politics in *Political Science: The State of the Discipline* (1983). *Foundations and Public Policy* became a required textbook at Harvard, Princeton, Georgetown, and other universities.

In 1986, Roelofs was the conference keynote speaker for the Philanthropy Project in Minneapolis, and in 1991 she had a three-week residency at the University of Helsinki. In 1990, she reported on the

relationship between “Foundations and Political Science” at the Paris meeting of the International Political Science Association. Subsequently, along with colleagues from the United States, Australia, Canada, and Finland, she helped create an IPSA research group analogous to the Caucus for a New Political Science: RC 49, Socialism, Capitalism, and Democracy. In 2007 she was guest editor of a special issue of *Critical Sociology* that focused on private foundations,

Roelofs has a continuing interest in French pre-Marxian socialism. She considers Charles Fourier’s ideas relevant to current problems, including the sharing of menial work; boring work; women’s equality; environmental degradation; oppressions of single, old, and unattractive people; and the horrors of war. In this vein, she served as an editor of *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism*. She has also spoken at the Rethinking Marxism and Socialist Scholars conferences, the Communal Societies Association, and the University of Bologna. Her article on Fourier appeared in the *World Review of Political Economy*, a Chinese Academy of Social Sciences journal.

After retiring in 2003, Roelofs translated Victor Considerant’s *Principles of Socialism: Manifesto of 19th Century Democracy*, a document that partially inspired Karl Marx’s and Frederick Engels’ *Communist Manifesto*, and yet there was no previous English translation. Considerant, who was Fourier’s leading disciple also influenced the U.S. Associationist movement.

Roelofs co-translated Fourier’s parody of war, “World War of Small Pastries.” She made political art, wrote for online publications, especially *Counterpunch*, and taught at the Center for Global Justice in San Miguel Allende, Mexico, and Cheshire

Academy for Lifelong Learning in Keene, New Hampshire. Roelofs’ final book, *The Trillion Dollar Silencer: Why There Is So Little Anti-War Protest in the United States* (2022), documents the pervasiveness of militarism in our economy and culture.

JOAN ROELOFS

References

- Chronicle of Higher Education*. 1983. “Results of Scholarly Research that Were Reported Last Week.” September 7.
- Considerant, Victor. 2006. *Principles of Socialism: Manifesto of 19th Century Democracy*. Translated by Joan Roelofs. Washington, D.C.: Maisonneuve Press.
- Finifter, Ada. ed. 1983. *Political Science: The State of the Discipline*. Washington, D.C.: American Political Science Association.
- Fourier, Charles. 2015. *The World War of Small Pastries*. Translated by Shawn P. Wilbur and Joan Roelofs. New York: Autonomedia.
- Roelofs, Joan. 1992. “Foundations and Political Science.” *New Political Science* (Fall): 3–28.
- Roelofs, Joan. 1996. *Greening Cities*. New York: Apex Press.
- Roelofs, Joan. 2003. *Foundations and Public Policy: The Mask of Pluralism*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Roelofs, Joan. 2022. *The Trillion Dollar Silencer*. Atlanta: Clarity Press.

Further readings

- Roelofs, Joan. 2015. “What Is Political Science and What Should It Be?” *International Critical Thought* 5, no. 3: 348–61.

See also

- Critical Legal Studies; Critique of Pluralism; Ecology; Power Structure Analysis; Social Movements Analysis; G. William Domhoff

227. Sarkees, Meredith Reid

Meredith Reid Sarkees (b. 1950, Niagara Falls) received her B.A. in Political Science at Antioch College (1972), her M.A. in International Affairs at George Washington University (1973) and her Ph.D. in Political Science at SUNY at Buffalo (1981). Sarkees has focused most of her career on topics neglected in mainstream professional journals. More specifically, she has undertaken research on the status of women in academia, women's role in foreign policy and international affairs and the correlates of war and peace.

While at Niagara University, where she earned the rank of Professor, Sarkees partnered with Nancy McGlen on several topics. Their first project examined the growth of part-time and off-the-tenure-track positions in the field of political science (McGlen and Sarkees 1988), which revealed that women were disproportionately impacted by these changes. They wrote several papers and an article (Sarkees and McGlen 1992) that discussed their subsequent findings that while women were increasingly earning Ph.D.s, they were failing to achieve full equality with men in political science. Their findings were rejected by some who believed women were getting "men's" jobs (Sarkees and McGlen 1999). Sarkees also conducted research on the status of women in the International Studies Association (ISA) with members of the Committee on the Status of Women (Sarkees and Henahan 2009, 1997). Most of the Committee's findings detailing the challenges facing women were never published, because they were deemed as not being of interest to male members. To address the problems facing women in the ISA, Sarkees co-authored grants for workshops to advance women in the field.

With a grant from the Center for the American Woman and Politics, Sarkees and McGlen conducted a study of the political views and status of women in the Departments of State and Defense. Using surveys of women and men in the upper ranks of the departments and in-depth interviews with women pioneers in both departments, their research detailed the barriers and discrimination that women had confronted, and

still faced, and that limited their progress in the Foreign Service and military (McGlen and Sarkees 1993; Sarkees and McGlen 1995). More controversially, their research found that women and men in Defense were equally likely to favor the use of force in foreign policy. Additional research by Sarkees revealed that these patterns continued a decade later (Sarkees 2008).

As Director of the Center for Women's Intercultural Leadership at St. Mary's College at Notre Dame, Sarkees continued her interest in women in foreign policy by developing programs on intercultural dialog and the role of women leaders in promoting peace (Sarkees 2003). As a part of this work, Sarkees interviewed global women leaders including women from Sri Lanka. The latter encouraged her to establish a nonprofit organization and to write grants to alleviate flooding and poverty and to support women peacemakers in the country.

In 1993, Sarkees' interest in the causes of and ways to prevent war led her to assume the position of Visiting Scholar and Data Manager of the Correlates of War (COW) project with J. David Singer at the University of Michigan. As host and co-host of the datasets, her research resulted in several books and articles that have focused on COW's link to peace (Sarkees 2000; Sarkees and Wayman 2010; Dixon and Sarkees 2015). She also co-edited a book of some of Singer's most important works (Macaulay, Lear, and Sarkees 2012).

Sarkees has held leadership roles in several organizations. For the Caucus for a New Political Science, she has been the chair, program chair, program committee member, secretary/treasurer, and managing editor (1989–94), and member of the editorial board (1994–present) for their journal *New Political Science*. While chair in 1988–89, she helped to restructure the group to become a section of the American Political Science Association (Barrow 2022, 18). She has also served as chair and program chair for the Women's Caucus for International Studies, co-treasurer for the Women's Caucus for Political Science, and President of the ISA-Northeast. Her awards include the Susan S. Northcutt Award for the Advancement of Women by the Women's Caucus for International Studies and the ISA.

NANCY E. MCGLEN

References

- Barrow, Clyde W. 2022. "What's in a Name? From New Political Science to Critical Political Science." *New Political Science* 44, no. 1 (February): 3–26.
- Dixon, Jeffrey and Meredith Reid Sarkees. 2015. *Intra-State Wars, 1816–2014: An Examination of Civil, Regional and Intercultural Wars*. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.
- Macaulay, Diane, Jody Lear, and Meredith Reid Sarkees, eds. 2012. *Advancing Peace Research: Leaving Traces, selected articles by J. David Singer*. New York: Routledge.
- McGlen, Nancy E. and Meredith Reid Sarkees. 1988. "Part-Time Faculty in Political Science: Stepchildren in the Profession." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 21, no. 2 (Spring): 293–8.
- McGlen, Nancy E. and Meredith Reid Sarkees. 1993. *Women in Foreign Policy: The Insiders*. New York: Routledge.
- Sarkees, Meredith Reid. 2008. "No Longer Just Top Hats and Monocles: Women as Foreign Policy Decision-makers." Presented at the Women and Political Leadership Research Conference, American University, Washington, DC, April 11–12, 2008.
- Sarkees, Meredith Reid. 2003. "Peace Movements: Voices in the Wilderness." In *Teamsters and Turtles*, edited by John Berg, 229–63. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Sarkees, Meredith Reid. 2000. "The Correlates of War Data on War: An Update to 1997." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 18, No. 1 (Fall): 123–44.
- Sarkees, Meredith Reid and Marie Henehan. 1997. "Gender Discrimination in the Academy? Yes, Survey Indicates." *International Studies Newsletter*, February.
- Sarkees, Meredith Reid and Marie Henehan. 2009. "Open Doors and Closed Ceilings: Gender-based Patterns and Attitudes in the International Studies Association." *International Studies Perspectives* 19, no. 4 (November): 428–36.
- Sarkees, Meredith Reid and Nancy E. McGlen. 1992. "Confronting Barriers: The Status of Women in Political Science." *Women & Politics* 12, no. 4: 43–86.
- Sarkees, Meredith Reid and Nancy E. McGlen. 1995. *The Status of Women in Foreign Policy*. New York: Headline Series Foreign Policy Association.
- Sarkees, Meredith Reid and Nancy E. McGlen. 1999. "Misdirected Backlash: The Evolving Nature of Academia and the Status of Women in Political Science." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 32, no.1 (March): 100–08.
- Sarkees, Meredith Reid and Frank Whelon Wayman. 2010. *Resort to War: A Data Guide to Inter-State, Extra-State, Intra-State, and Non-State Wars, 1816–2007*. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.

228. Schram, Sanford

Sanford Schram is a prominent activist-scholar best known for his work on poverty, race, and social welfare policy. Schram earned a B.A. degree at St. Lawrence University (1971). He earned an M.A. (1973) and Ph.D. (1979) in Political Science at the State University of New York, Albany. He began his academic career in the Department of Political Science at SUNY, Potsdam (1978–91), but subsequently taught at Macalester College (1991–96), the University of Hawai'i (1996–97). He is currently on the faculty of the Political Science Department at Hunter College, CUNY and in Political Science and Sociology at the CUNY Graduate Center. He also had been active as a Faculty Associate at the Roosevelt House Public Policy Institute (which is part of Hunter College). Schram is a long-time member of the Caucus for a New Political Science (CNPS), which he joined due to the inspiration of founding members Murray Edelman and Frances Fox Piven, who served as longstanding mentors to Schram. In 2012, Schram received the Charles A. McCoy Career Achievement Award from the Caucus for a New Political Science.

Schram has written six books, co-authored three others, edited or co-edited seven more, for a total of 16 books. Two of his books, the solely authored *Words of Welfare: The Poverty of Social Science and the Social Science of Poverty* (Schram 1995) and *Disciplining the Poor: Neoliberal Paternalism and the Persistent Power of Race* (Soss, Fording, and Schram 2011), co-authored with Joe Soss and Richard Fording, received the Michael Harrington Award from the New Political Science Section of the American Political Science Association for books dedicated to promoting social change. *Disciplining the Poor* also received multiple other awards including the Oliver Cromwell Cox Award (2012) from the American Sociological Association for the best book combating racism and the American Library Association Choice Outstanding Academic Title for 2013.

Schram's empirical research has appeared in the *American Political Science Review*, the *American Journal of Political Science*, the *American Sociological Review*, the *American Journal of Sociology*, and other academic journals, as well as *The Washington Post* and other mass media publications. His

most recent book, co-authored with Richard Fording, is entitled *Hard White: The Mainstreaming of Racism in American Politics* (Fording and Schram, 2020) and has been cited as accurately predicting the mainstreaming of explicitly racist politics as practiced by Donald Trump and his followers.

In 2013 Schram published a memoir, *Becoming a Footnote: An Activist-Scholar Finds His Voice, Learns to Write and Survives Academia* (Schram, 2013), where he details his struggles to succeed at marrying activism and scholarship as inspired in particular by Piven and her husband Richard A. Cloward. A few years before, Schram with Corey Shdaimah and Roland Stahl, co-authored *Change Research: A Case on Collaborative Methods for Social Workers and Advocates* (2011) which highlighted their participation as researchers working with people active in the Philadelphia Affordable Housing Coalition to create an Affordable Housing Trust Fund for the City. Schram's empirical research on welfare migration served to create the research basis for the American Civil Liberties Union's successful litigation that led to the Supreme Court striking down state durational residency requirements in the case *Saenz v. Roe* (1999). Schram had previously discussed his research on welfare, racial discrimination and related issues when he testified in the first congressional hearing about welfare reform in 2001 (right after the 9/11 attacks). Schram continues to be dedicated to striving to be an activist-scholar who uses his scholarship to help "speak truth to power." Most recently he has been active on multiple fronts in trying to resist Trumpism and the threat it poses to the U.S. moving further down the road to becoming an inclusive multiracial democracy.

RONI STRIER AND GUY FELDMAN

References

- Fording, Richard C. and Sanford F. Schram. 2020. *Hard White: The Mainstreaming of Racism in American Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schram, Sanford. 1995. *Words of Welfare: The Poverty of Social Science and the Social Science of Poverty*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Schram, Sanford. 2013. *Becoming a Footnote: An Activist-Scholar Finds His Voice, Learns to Write, and Survives Academia*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Shdaimah, Corey S., Roland W. Stahl, and Sanford F. Schram. 2011. *Change Research: A Case Study on Collaborative Methods for Social Workers and Advocates*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Soss, Joe, Richard C. Fording, and Sanford F. Schram. 2011. *Disciplining the Poor: Neoliberal Paternalism and the Persistent Power of Race*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

See also

Poverty; Social Movement Analysis;
Autoethnography

229. Sedghi, Hamideh

Hamideh Sedghi is a prominent political scientist, scholar, and teacher, who has made significant contributions to Middle Eastern studies and Critical Political Science. Sedghi was the first Iranian woman in the United States to publish social scientific analyses of women in Iran. She was a founding member of the Caucus for a New Political Science.

Sedghi was born in Tehran, Iran and immigrated to the United States to pursue academic studies. She earned a B.A. in Political Science from the University of California, Berkeley, an M.A. from California State University, Chico, and a Ph.D. in Political Science from the City University of New York. She has taught at Villanova University, University of Richmond, Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Vassar College, Bard College, and Lehman College, and she has been a consultant to the Office of the United Nations Secretariat.

Sedghi is perhaps best known for her book, *Women and Politics in Iran* (2007), which deploys an interdisciplinary analysis of politics, culture, and economics to provide an integrated understanding of the private and public lives of women in Iran and the Islamic world (Harvard Center for Middle Eastern Studies 2006). In this book, Sedghi provides an exhaustive analysis of the intersection between political power, religious ideology, and the bodies of women in Iran by contrasting between three time periods: the Qajar dynasty, the Pahlavi era, and the Islamic Republic (Sedghi 2007).

Sedghi's book has been recognized for explaining the importance of politics in gender relations and the role of women's agency in determining policy outcomes. It facilitates an understanding of the complexities of power and resistance in societies in which gender plays a determining role in shaping social and political life. Sedghi argues that the state is a gendered actor, that its policies are often discriminatory, and that it often uses gender as an instrument to legitimize its power. In this way, the desire to control women's sexuality alludes to the power struggle between men, which is the fruit and consequence of their own masculinity, political decisions, and global image of the state (Sedghi 2007, Gerami 2013). Sedghi problematizes the ways in which the state

controls women's bodies to legitimize public policies in the face of internal contingencies and international audiences, with a particular focus on the use of the hijab. Through interviews, the author explores how women reacted to the state's tactical use of women's clothing through the establishment of formal organizations and underground factions. Sedghi also questions the universalization of the category "women," by exposing the role played by elite women as key agents for the official state narrative. This text has enriched political science in its understanding of the relationship between gender, religious ideology, and political power, and the ways in which women respond to the use of their bodies as an instrument for state power.

Her research has continued to focus on gender politics in Iran and the Middle East, more broadly, and it has appeared in journals such as *Socialism and Democracy* and *New Political Science*. Moreover, Sedghi's research draws on primary sources from fieldwork, interviews, and oral tradition collections, as well as secondary sources in Persian and English (Harvard University Center for Middle Eastern Studies 2006; St. Ambrose University 2014). The inclusion of these sources in her work has allowed for a new disciplinary understanding of women's agency in relation to state power. In this way, it has answered the orientalist academic visions that perceive women as victims or powerless subjects that must be saved or liberated from the intervention of Western countries (Sedghi 2007). Sedghi's body of work has shed new light on the ways in which different types of women resist state power in their public and private lives (Gerami 2013).

For this reason, Sedghi has been recognized for her contributions to political science and Middle East studies and has received multiple awards such as the Christian Bay Award for the Best Paper (2005) awarded by the New Political Science Section of the American Political Science Association Meeting (Harvard Center for Middle Eastern Studies 2006).

SOFÍA PÉREZ GIL

References

- Gerami, Shahin. 2013. "Reviewed Work(s): *Women and Politics in Iran: Veiling, Unveiling, and Reveiling* by Hamideh Sedghi." *Iranian Studies* 46, no. 1 (January): 133–4.

Harvard University Center for Middle Eastern Studies. "CMES Welcomes 2006/2007 Visiting Scholars and Post-Doctoral Fellows." Available at www-personal.umich.edu/~twod/oil-ns/articles/research-07/research-iran/hamideh_sedgi_harvard.htm. Accessed February 20, 2023.

St. Ambrose University. 2014. "Iranian Author is First Middle East Institute Visiting Scholar." Available at www.sau.edu/iranian-author-mei-visiting-sscholar-. Accessed February 20, 2023.

Sedghi, Hamideh. 2007. *Women and Politics in Iran: Veiling, Unveiling, and Reveiling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

See also

Gender; Feminism and the State; Intersectionality

230. Singer, J. David

J. David Singer (b. December 7, 1925, Brooklyn; d. December 28, 2009 Ann Arbor) was an internationally recognized pioneer in the quantitative study of war. Yet, he considered himself to be a researcher, a political activist, and a teacher/mentor in equal measures.

Singer served in the U.S. Navy in World War II, and the GI bill helped finance his college education (for a detailed autobiography, see Singer 2012). Returning to the Navy during the Korean War, Singer's success as an instructor at the officer training school persuaded him to pursue a career in higher education. While taking night classes, Singer emerged as a political activist, assuming leadership positions in the United World Federalists, which sought to end war by empowering the United Nations. Singer earned a Ph.D. from New York University in 1956.

Early in his academic career, Singer received a fellowship to Harvard, where he met Kenneth Boulding, who headed the Center for Research on Conflict Resolution (CRCR) at the University of Michigan. Boulding helped to shape Singer's thinking as a peace researcher. Singer got a job in Michigan's Political Science Department in 1958, but his political activism immediately created intra-departmental difficulties. In addition to frequent public speeches, Singer wrote a series of articles for *The Nation* (1959) in support of nuclear disarmament, an unpopular political position at the time. Consequently, Singer's contract at Michigan was not renewed. Singer spent a brief stint at the U.S. Naval War College, where he met Quincy Wright, whose tome, *A Study of War* (1942), became a model for Singer's future data-gathering. Singer also completed *Deterrence, Arms Control, and Disarmament* (1962), which several publishers rejected due to its "doveish" message.

Singer returned to Michigan in 1961, with a position at the Mental Health Research Institute (MHRI), which was a "systems think tank" applying scientific methods to the study of human behavior. Singer's initial foray became one of his seminal articles: "The Levels of Analysis Problem in International Relations" (1961). Ultimately, Singer decided to apply the scientific method to the study of

war, because he felt that in order to prevent war, one must first understand it. In this vein, Singer was awarded a fellowship in 1963 to the University of Oslo, where he assisted in the organization of the Peace Research Institute (PRIO). The following year, Singer secured a permanent position in the Political Science Department at Oslo.

The year 1964 began what Singer referred to as the "golden age" of world politics at Michigan. He was able to restructure courses and to offer fellowships to students. Singer formalized the Correlates of War project (COW), serving as its director, while recruiting Melvin Small as project historian. Singer and Small (1966) began by focusing on the global system that emerged after 1815, and then, with Bruce Russett, created the project's first database; an enumeration of the members of the interstate system (Russett, Singer, and Small 1968). Singer and Small went on to develop a classification of wars based on the types of actors involved in the wars. Data on interstate and extra-state wars were presented in *The Wages of War* (Singer and Small 1972), while intra-state wars were added in *Resort to Arms* (Small and Singer 1982). Meanwhile, additional data-gathering incorporated actors correlated to wars, such as power, proximity, alliance, and IGO (inter-governmental organization) memberships.

Singer felt that academics had an obligation to apply their expertise to contemporary political issues. He saw COW, and statistical analyses in general, as a means by which to confront the ideological bent of Political Science and American foreign policy. Within academe, Singer became involved with the Caucus for a New Political Science as it challenged the American Political Science Association over its unwillingness to allow discussions of current events at its conferences. He also served on the Editorial Board of the Caucus' journal, *New Political Science*. In the public realm, Singer continued his anti-war activism, demonstrating with groups such as Veterans for Peace, even offering to serve as a "peace hostage" in Hanoi.

Over almost 60 years, the COW project has become one of the most wide-ranging and significant projects in world politics. Singer and those utilizing COW data have produced hundreds of books and articles augmenting our understandings of war and peace (some of which were summarized in Geller and Singer (1998). In recognition of Singer's con-

tributions to academe, Singer was *inter alia* elected: President, Peace Research Society (International) (1972–73); and President, International Studies Association (1985–86). He was also honored with the Founder's Medal, Peace Science Society (Inaugural Award 2001).

MEREDITH REID SARKEES

References

- Geller, Daniel S. and J. David Singer. 1998. *Nations at War: A Scientific Study of International Conflict*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Russett, Bruce M., J. David Singer, and Melvin Small. 1968. "National Political Units in the Twentieth Century: A Standardized List." *American Political Science Review* 62, no. 3 (September): 932–51.
- Singer, J. David. 1959. "Rethinking the Security Problem: New Hope for Disarmament." *The Nation* 189, no.11 (10 October): 203–05.
- Singer, J. David. 1961. "The Levels of Analysis Problem in International Relations." *World Politics* 14, no.1 (October): 77–92.
- Singer, J. David. 1962. *Deterrence, Arms Control, and Disarmament: Toward a Synthesis in National Security Policy*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.
- Singer, J. David. 2012. "Who is This Fellow?" In *Advancing Peace Research: Leaving Traces, Selected Articles by J. David Singer*, edited by Jody B. Lear, Diane Macaulay, and Meredith Reid Sarkees, 1–16. New York: Routledge.
- Singer, J. David and Melvin Small. 1966. "The Composition and Status Ordering of the International System: 1815–1940." *World Politics* 18, no. 2 (January): 236–82.
- Singer, J. David and Melvin Small. 1972. *The Wages of War, 1816–1965: A Statistical Handbook*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Small, Melvin and J. David Singer. 1982. *Resort to Arms: International and Civil War, 1816–1980*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Wright, Quincy. 1942. *A Study of War*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Further readings

- Correlates of War website: correlatesofwar.org
- Morrow, James D. and William Clark, Paul F. Diehl, James Lee Ray, Meredith Reid Sarkees, Thomas C. Walker. 2010. "J. David Singer: In Memoriam." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 43, no. 3 (July): 590–93.

231. Skinner, Quentin

Quenton Skinner (b. November 26, 1940–) remarked that “I am the last of the amateurs. In England I am regarded as an historian, in France as a philosopher and in the United States as a political scientist,” to Finnish students in 1999. Skinner is a trained historian, who was professor at Cambridge from 1978 to 2007 and at the Queen Mary University, London from 2008 to 2022. Skinner’s main work focuses on Renaissance and early modern Europe with implications for contemporary politics.

Following R.G. Collingwood, Skinner (1969) regards the historical context as a critical tool against perennial problems and anachronistic mythologies of coherence, doctrine, prolepsis, and parochialism. Scholars should identify the conventions of the context and what the actors “are doing” with them. Sharing Ludwig Wittgenstein’s views on the meaning of concepts being in their uses, Skinner (1988, 283) demands that scholars study the histories of concepts as their “uses in argument.”

In *The Foundations* Skinner (1978, xi, xii–xiii) proposes a program for studying politics: “For I take it that political life itself sets problems for political theorist.” He polemicizes against the fashion of studying politics as the application of theories from more advanced fields, such as economics, and discards the widespread academic contempt for politics and politicians. For him theories are neither independent entities nor *ex post* rationalizations, but rather tools for legitimization. A political actor is “tailoring his normative language in order to fit his projects” as well as “tailoring his project in order to fit the available normative language.”

Skinner (1978) deals with Machiavelli or the Huguenots as political actors in time and recommends reading Hobbes’s *Leviathan* as if reading “a speech in parliament.” He (2018, 11) regards theorizing as “intervention in pre-existing debates ... trying to recover the problems they were originally designed to solve.” He extends the textual genres into studying political thought (for paintings 2002b/II, chapters 3–4 and 2018, chapter 10; for theatre, 2014).

In *Reason and Rhetoric*, Quentin Skinner (1996) emphasizes the contingency of political thought and action, present in the regular

possibility to argue for or against a move. He offers a new perspective on conceptual change with the scheme *paradiastolic* re-descriptions, altering the normative value of concepts by modifying naming, range, significance, or meaning of concepts (1996, chapter 4). Against the structuralists Skinner (2002b/I, 7) insists: “We may be freer as we sometimes suppose.”

Skinner (1989, 123) provides a genealogy of the state as the “master noun of the political argument.” For him (1989, 112), the state implies a double abstraction, from both the rulers and the ruled, an impersonal “entity with a life of its own” but which is “able ... to call allegiance of both parties.” This is fully realized by Hobbes, for whom the state is “an artificial person” (Skinner 1989, 404). “Hobbes wishes us to recognise” the state “not merely as ‘one person in law’ but as the seat of power” (Skinner 1989, 41). For Hobbes, “the battle to unify Europe was eventually lost ... by the emergence of individual nation-states” (Skinner 1989, 317) – today an argument for Brexit.

Furthermore, Skinner has “recovered lost treasures” in the neo-Roman concept of liberty, classically formulated in Justinian’s *Digest*. A person is free, when not being dependent on the arbitrary powers of others (Skinner 1998), including depending on the slavish mentality (Skinner 2002a). The English republicans extended paradigms of slavery and servitude to royal prerogatives, to which they opposed the “free state” (Skinner 2018, 157–61). Against the dominant Hobbesian view on freedom from inference, Skinner (2008) considers the neo-Roman view as being relevant for contemporary politics. The persistent value of freedom from dependence is illustrated with the parliamentary principles of free speech, free mandate, freedom from arrest as well as free and fair elections.

KARI PALONEN

References

- Skinner, Quentin. 1969. “Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas.” *History and Theory* 8, no. 1: 3–53.
- Skinner, Quentin. 1978. *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Skinner, Quentin. 1988. “A Reply to My Critics.” In *Meaning and Context: Quentin Skinner and*

- His Critics*, edited by James Tully, 231–88. Cambridge: Polity.
- Skinner, Quentin. 1989. “The State.” In *Political Innovation and Conceptual Change*, edited by Terence Ball, James Farr and Russell L. Hansen, 90–131. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Skinner, Quentin. 1996. *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Skinner, Quentin. 1998. *Liberty before Liberalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Skinner, Quentin. 2002a. “A Third Concept of Liberty.” *Proceedings of the British Academy* 117: 237–68.
- Skinner, Quentin. 2002b. *Visions of Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Vol. I, *Regarding Method*, Vol. II, *Renaissance Virtues*.
- Skinner, Quentin. 2008. *Hobbes on Republican Liberty*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Skinner, Quentin. 2009. “A Genealogy of the Modern State.” *Proceedings of the British Academy* 162: 325–70.
- Skinner, Quentin. 2014. *Forensic Shakespeare*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Skinner, Quentin. 2018. *From Humanism to Hobbes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Further readings

- Palonen, Kari. 2003. *Quentin Skinner. History, Politics, Rhetoric*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Brett, Annabel and James Tully, eds. 2006. *Rethinking the Foundations of Modern Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dawson, Hannah and Annelien de Dijn (eds). 2022. *Rethinking Liberty before Liberalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

232. Snyder-Hall, Claire

Claire Snyder-Hall (b. 1965 Delaware, Ohio), and previously known as R. Claire Snyder, grew up in Sarasota, Florida. Her father was a Methodist minister, academic historian, and lifelong pacifist, who spent his career teaching and learning at New College of Florida. Her mother was a former missionary with an M.A. in religious education. Snyder-Hall received her B.A. *cum laude* in Psychology from Smith College (1986) and her Ph.D. in Political Science with majors in political theory, women and politics, and political economy from Rutgers University in New Brunswick, New Jersey (1997). At Rutgers she studied Marxism and critical theory with Stephen Eric Bronner, democratic theory with Benjamin R. Barber, and feminist theory with Linda Zerilli. After a short stint teaching at Illinois State University (1998–2000), Snyder-Hall spent the bulk of her academic career at George Mason University (2000–12). She eventually became so frustrated by neoliberal trends within higher education that she left academia to become an independent scholar-activist.

During her years in the Ivory Tower, Snyder-Hall pursued a research agenda that sought to change the world, not just study it. Indeed, it was her early experiences in left politics during the 1980s in the feminist peace and justice movement that inspired her to pursue a career in political science in the first place. Snyder-Hall chose Rutgers for her graduate work because it had just started the first-ever women and politics program, part of a movement of feminist scholarship that would profoundly change the face of political science. Her dissertation, *Citizen-Soldiers and Manly Warriors: Military Service and Gender in the Civic Republican Tradition* (1999), utilized Judith Butler's then groundbreaking theory of gender identity to theorize citizenship as constructed by engagement in civic practices.

Throughout her career, Snyder-Hall's teaching and research focused largely on democratic theory, a field that aspired to be trans-ideological but that often leaned to the right of the ideological spectrum. Snyder-Hall engaged the field from an explicitly left position. Her second book, *Gay Marriage and Democracy: Equality for All* (2003), responds directly to "democratic" argu-

ments against marriage equality leveled by mainstream academics, such as Jean Bethke Elshtain and Bill Galston, who portrayed the traditional patriarchal family as the necessary "seedbed of virtue" underlying democracy, as well as evangelical claims that the U.S. is a "Christian nation." Snyder-Hall continued her criticisms of conservative politics in the book, *Right-Wing Populism and the Media*, which she co-edited with Cynthia Burack.

Towards the end of her time at George Mason University, Snyder-Hall's scholarship grappled with a central challenge within feminist theory; namely, the conflict between the quest for gender equality and the desire for sexual pleasure, which fragmented the movement in the 1980s and beyond. With articles in *Signs* (2008), *Politics and Gender* (2008), and *Perspectives on Politics* (2010), Snyder-Hall articulated an inclusive, pluralistic, and non-judgmental vision of third-wave feminism that respects the right of women to decide for themselves how to negotiate the conflicts between pleasure, danger, and equality. Snyder-Hall argues that third-wave feminism exhibits not a thoughtless endorsement of every choice a woman makes as feminist, but rather offers a deep respect for pluralism and self-determination.

Snyder-Hall continued pursuing her politically engaged research agenda after leaving academia. Her fourth book, *Battling the Prince: A Woman Fights for Democracy* (2021), is an auto-ethnographic study that focuses on Snyder-Hall's activist work, including her early years as a left-wing activist in the 1980s, her grassroots campaign for state senate in 2014, her eight years as a leader in the Democratic Party, her work as a lobbyist for democracy reform in the state legislature, and her experiences with progressive social movements and community-building. The book utilizes an intersectional understanding of identity, as it analyses political culture in the United States, criticizes rising authoritarianism, and offers a vision for leftward movement.

Even while working as an independent scholar, however, Snyder-Hall has kept one foot in the realm of academia by continuing her longstanding membership in Caucus for a Critical Political Science, the socialist section of the American Political Science Association. Indeed, in 2020, she became co-editor of the Caucus's journal, *New*

Political Science: A Journal of Politics and Culture, with Judith Grant.

Her other foot remains firmly within the realm of professional advocacy. At the time of this writing, Snyder-Hall serves as Executive Director of Common Cause Delaware, working on protecting the freedom to vote; ending partisan gerrymandering; getting money out of politics; strengthening transparency, ethics, and accountability; and advancing racial justice.

CLAIRE SNYDER-HALL

References

- Snyder, R. Claire. 1999. *Citizen-Soldiers and Manly Warriors: Military Service and Gender in the Civic Republican Tradition*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Snyder, R. Claire. 2006. *Gay Marriage and Democracy*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Snyder, R. Claire. 2008. "The Ideology of Wifely Submission: A Challenge for Feminism?" *Politics and Gender* 4, no. 4 (December): 563–86.
- Snyder, R. Claire. 2008. "Third Wave Feminism: A New Directions Essay." *Signs: A Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 34, no. 1 (Autumn): 175–96.
- Snyder-Hall, Claire. 2010. "Third-Wave Feminism and the Defense of 'Choice'." *Perspectives on Politics* 8, no. 1 (March): 255–61.
- Snyder-Hall, Claire and Cynthia Burack, eds., 2014. *Right-Wing Populism and the Media*. New York: Routledge.
- Snyder-Hall, Claire. 2021. *Battling the Prince: A Woman Fights for Democracy*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

233. Steger, Manfred

Steger, Manfred (b. Austria, 1961–present) is an influential theorist of globalization and an early founder of the field of global studies. He is best known for tracing the evolution of globalization’s competing ideological underpinnings and identifying how ideologies once structured around nationality gave way to new ideologies centered around globality.

Steger received his Advanced Diploma in Banking and Finance at First Austrian Bank Business College in Vienna in 1984 and, after graduation, briefly worked in the banking sector. He left his native Austria in 1986 to pursue a B.A. in Religion and Political Science at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, Honolulu, HI (1990) and completed a Master’s at the same institution in 1991. Four years later he completed his Ph.D. in Political Science at Rutgers University, in New Brunswick, New Jersey. His dissertation, under the supervision of Stephen Eric Bronner, was published two years later by Cambridge University Press, and examines Eduard Bernstein’s theory of evolutionary socialism in the context of the German social democratic tradition. In 1996, after a brief stint at Whitman College, Steger accepted a position in the Department of Politics and Government at Illinois State University. He reached full Professor in 2003 before leaving two years later to accept the position of Professor of Global Studies at the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT) in Melbourne, Australia. At RMIT Steger led the Globalization and Culture Program at the Global Cities Institute and directed the Globalism Research Centre. In 2011 he returned to University of Hawai‘i as Professor of Political Science, later moving to the Department of Sociology.

His 2002 book *Globalism: The New Market Ideology* – which won the 2003 Michael Harrington Book Award from the New Political Science (NPS) section of the American Political Science Association (APSA) – intervened in then contentious debates about whether the end of the Cold War constituted the end of ideology. Steger argued instead that the world was actually witnessing the rise of a new ideology, globalism, which he called “the dominant political ideology of our time – that is, the dominant system of ideas that make claims

about social processes” (Steger 2002, 6). Globalists, who espouse a pro-free market globalism, found themselves in conflict with various right- and left-wing variants of anti-globalism, including right-wing extremists, Bolivarian national populists, those supporting the anti-WTO protests in Seattle, among others (Steger 2002, 81–116). The following year Steger published *Globalization: A Very Short Introduction*, currently in its fifth edition and translated into more than a dozen languages. This book examines the intersecting dimensions of globalization – economic, political, cultural, ecological, and ideological – and draws a core distinction between globalism (the ideology), globality (the social condition), and globalization. He defines globalization as a “*matrix of social processes* that is transforming our present social condition of conventional nationality into one of globality” (Steger 2020, 2).

Steger explores the transition from nationality to globality in greater detail in his 2008 book, *The Rise of the Global Imaginary: Political Ideologies from the French Revolution to the Global War on Terror*. This book examines the nineteenth- and twentieth-century ideologies undergirding the national imaginary (British Liberalism, French Conservatism, German Socialism, Russian Communism, and German Nazism) and how they gradually gave way to new competing ideologies (Market, Justice, Jihadist, and Imperial globalisms) forming a global imaginary. Subsequent books explore these competing ideologies in greater depth. For example, *Justice Globalism* (2012) draws upon interviews from nearly four dozen groups linked to the World Social Forum to probe the underlying ideological foundations of the global justice movement.

In addition to his scholarly contributions, Steger has played an important role establishing global studies as an academic field. At RMIT Steger worked to combine and transform two existing schools into the School of Global Studies, Social Science, and Planning, creating the first Anglophone academic unit with “global studies” in its name (Steger and Wahlrab 2017, 45–6). Under his leadership, RMIT expanded the number of undergraduate and graduate programs, faculty lines, research centers, speaker series, and other institutional resources committed to the study of globalization. Other contributions to the field include co-editing the *Globalization*

book series, with Terrell Carver, at Rowman and Littlefield, which has published more than two dozen books drawing upon interdisciplinary approaches to understand various dimensions of globalization (such as war, labor, governance, and American culture). Steger has also written and edited numerous handbooks and readers on the field of global studies.

In addition to his work on globalization, Steger has also written extensively on non-violence, Zen Buddhism, and populist political movements. Rooted in his scholarly interest in the ideological foundations of nationalism, his writing on non-violence explores the tensions – exemplified in Gandhi’s thought and practice – between an ethical commitment to nonviolence and the practical questions of seizing political power and establishing an independent nation-state. Steger is also a practicing Zen Buddhist, who teaches and writes about his religious practice. He has published two books in collaboration with his partner, Perle Besserman, that examine Buddhism’s grassroots and radical political potential.

ISAAC KAMOLA

References

- Steger, Manfred. 1997. *The Quest for Evolutionary Socialism: Eduard Bernstein and Social Democracy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Steger, Manfred. 2000. *Gandhi’s Dilemma: Nonviolent Principles and Nationalist Power*. New York: St. Martin’s Press.
- Steger, Manfred. 2002. *Globalism: The New Market Ideology*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Steger, Manfred. 2008. *The Rise of the Global Imaginary: Political Ideologies from the French Revolution to the Global War on Terror*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Steger, Manfred. 2020. *Globalization: A Very Short Introduction*, 5th edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Steger, Manfred, James Goodman, and Erin K. Wilson. 2012. *Justice Globalism: Ideology, Crises, Policy*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Steger, Manfred, and Amentahru Wahlrab. 2017. *What Is Global Studies?: Theory and Practice*. New York: Routledge.

Further readings

- Crothers, Lane. 2021. *Globalization and American Popular Culture*. Globalization Series, Manfred Steger and Terrell Carver, eds. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

See also

- Global Studies as Critical Political Science;
Globalization; Ideology; Bronner, Stephen Eric

234. Surkin, Marvin

Marvin Surkin (1938–present) was a founding member of the Caucus for a New Political Science in 1967, while a graduate student at New York University. Surkin received his B.A. in Political Science from the University of Florida, Gainesville (1960). He earned his Ph.D. in Political Science at New York University (1972) and wrote his dissertation on “Maurice Merleau-Ponty and the Phenomenological Critique of Political Science” under the supervision of Bertell Ollman (chair) and H. Mark Roelofs. He is a specialist in comparative urban politics and social change.

Surkin began his career as a professor at Moravian College (1966–68) and Borough of Manhattan Community College (1968–69), but thereafter he became something of an itinerant professor with adjunct and visiting positions at Adelphi University (1969–71), LaGuardia Community College (1971–74), Autonomous University of Barcelona (1972–73), Fairleigh Dickinson University (1976), The Union Institute and University (1978–2005), Universidad Autonoma del Estado de Morelos (2003–06), and Long Island University and Ramapo State College of New Jersey (2011). For a period of time, Surkin practiced clinical acupuncture in private practice (1987–93) and St. Joseph’s Hospital (1988–93).

While still a graduate student, Surkin achieved notoriety in 1967 by calling for members to walk out of the 1967 American Political Science Association business meeting after APSA officials turned off microphones to quell a raucous discussion from the floor of the convention (Schrecker 2021, 360). Members were dissatisfied by the lack of conference panels on the Vietnam War, poverty, and urban riots, but the main source of dissatisfaction was that Article II of the APSA Constitution was used by officials to block votes on any resolutions that took political positions on these issues. Surkin’s call for a walk out sparked a series of rump meetings at the 1967 Chicago convention, which led to the founding of the Caucus for a New Political Science. Surkin was elected to the first CNPS executive committee and was an active leader in the organization until the early 1980s (Barrow 2017, 2022).

Surkin (1968, 179) wrote one of the first articles explaining the origins and purpose of the CNPS, which condemned “the expansion of cold-war oriented research in the social sciences” through an exposé of the ties between two top APSA officials and the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency. Surkin described the new Caucus as “composed mostly of young liberals – graduate students and faculty – who had begun to feel estranged by the unwillingness of the APSA to take stands on issues of critical importance to the country and the world.” He (1968, 180) noted that a sprinkling of the Caucus’s founders were “young radicals who were still breathing the tumultuous air of the National Conference for a New Politics,” which had also convened in Chicago a few days earlier for the purpose of forging a unified political program among white and black radicals of the New Left. Surkin described the young radicals as leaning “toward socialism and progressive politics, anti-imperialism, and so on” and he identified himself as “more into that orientation” than into liberalism. It is likely that the Caucus took its name – “New Political Science” – from the young radicals who had attended this conference the previous week. Surkin (1969) followed up on his exposé by initiating a debate with Ithiel de Sola Pool (1966, 1970) on whether political scientists should work as consultants to corporate and government organizations, which Surkin claimed infused their scholarship and teaching with the ideological biases of ruling elites, while implicating political scientists in the exploitative, and even criminal, practices of these organizations.

Surkin helped lead the CNPS in a more radical direction when he co-edited (with Alan Wolfe) *An End to Political Science: The Caucus Papers* (1970). The book was a collection of essays, which proclaimed the end of political science as it was currently taught and practiced in the United States. According to Surkin and Wolfe (1970, 5): “To change political science will require a critique of the current [behavioral-pluralist] paradigm and the development of alternative modes of research, theory, and social practice. The only way this is possible is by ending the hegemony of political science over its students.” The essays in “The Caucus Papers” were largely authored by newly minted assistant professors working at the periphery of the academic establishment, and

many of the chapters previewed a wave of forthcoming books that were highly critical of the behavioral-pluralist paradigm and the political science discipline generally. Most of the essays advanced a radical critique of political science, including essays written by self-proclaimed Marxists, socialists, phenomenologists, and radical democrats. Clyde W. Barrow (2017, 454) has called *An End to Political Science* “the manifesto” of the emergent Caucus for a New Political Science.

Surkin remained an active leader in the CNPS until the 1980s, when he began to drift out of academia to pursue community organizing, urban politics, and adult education. Surkin observes that by this time he “was moving more to the left, no longer teaching political science and very involved in the work I was doing related to the publication of my co-authored book (with Dan Georgakas), *Detroit: I Do Mind Dying, A Study in Urban Revolution* (1975). *Detroit* is Surkin’s most influential work. It recounts how black autoworkers organized their own auto union in the 1970s – the Dodge Revolutionary Union Movement (DRUM) in opposition to the white-dominated, and sometimes racially discriminatory United Auto Workers. The book served as the inspiration for the 1999 Film, *Finally Got The News-Revolutionary Black Unions in Detroit*. *Detroit* is considered by many to be one of the best books written on the black liberation movement and, as a result, it has gone through three editions in the United States, a British edition, and it translated into French (2015). *Counterpunch* listed the book as one of the top 100 books of the twentieth century.

Since 2008, Surkin has been a professor at the Intercultural Open University Foundation, an international non-profit charitable organization that provides distance learning courses to master’s and Ph.D. students in develop-

ing countries. Surkin conducts workshops on Workplace and Community Organizing, Urban Political Economy, and Urban Renewal in the U.S.A. and its Significance for Development in the Third World. Dr. Surkin has served as consultant to the New World Foundation, which seeks to help progressive community activist in the United States, Mexico, and around the world build stronger alliances to social justice, civil rights, economic, and electoral issues.

MARVIN SURKIN

References

- Barrow, Clyde W. 2017. “The Political and Intellectual Origins of New Political Science.” *New Political Science* 39, no. 4 (December): 437–72.
- Barrow, Clyde W. 2022. “What’s in a Name? From New Political Science to Critical Political Science.” *New Political Science* 44, no. 1 (February): 1–24.
- Georgakas, Dan and Marvin Surkin. 1975. *Detroit: I Do Mind Dying: A Study in Urban Revolution*. New York: St. Martin’s Press.
- de Sola Pool, Ithiel. 1966. “The Necessity for Social Scientists Doing Research for Governments.” *Background* 10 (August): 111–22.
- de Sola Pool, Ithiel. 1970. “Some Facts about Values.” *PS* 3, no. 2 (Spring): 102–06.
- Schrecker, Ellen. 2021. *The Lost Promise: American Universities in the 1960s*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Surkin, Marvin. 1968. “Political Science: The Battle for Integrity.” *The Nation* (September 2): 179–81.
- Surkin, Marvin. 1969. “Sense and Nonsense in Politics.” *PS* 2, no. 4 (Autumn): 573–81.
- Surkin, Marvin and Alan Wolfe. Eds. 1970. *An End to Political Science: The Caucus Papers*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1970.

See also

Phenomenology; Bertell Ollman; H Mark Roelofs

235. Sweezy, Paul M.

Paul M. Sweezy (1910–2004) was a Marxist economist born in New York City to an American upper-class family. His father was vice-president of First National Bank of New York. He studied economics at Harvard University, but had to temporarily interrupt his studies when his father died in 1931. Sweezy's first exposure to Marxist ideas came in 1932–33, when he was a visiting graduate student at the London School of Economics and became acquainted with some of the left-wing Keynesians at Cambridge University. Sweezy (1933) co-founded the *Review of Economic Studies* and published in its first issue a small article on relative income shares. He returned to Harvard in 1933 and took a position as a teaching assistant for Joseph A. Schumpeter. Sweezy (1981, 13) indicates that he returned to the United States in 1933 as a “convinced but very ignorant Marxist.” From 1936 onwards, Sweezy lectured at Harvard on the economics of socialism, earning his Ph.D. in economics in 1937, and eventually publishing his still influential *The Theory of Capitalist Development* (Sweezy 1942a).

Sweezy was strongly influenced by John Maynard Keynes's *General Theory of Employment* (1936) and the new theory of “monopolistic competition” (Chamberlain 1933, Robinson 1933). Sweezy (1938a) published on expectations and uncertainty and on the pricing behavior of oligopolistic firms (Sweezy 1939a). He also participated in the influential bestseller *An Economic Program for American Democracy* (Gilbert et al. 1938) and wrote a pioneering appendix on interest groups in the American economy (Sweezy 1939b). The latter work was one of the first empirical studies to lay the foundations for power structure and network analysis of the capitalist class.

During the late 1930s, Sweezy was also involved in the on-going discussions about economic stagnation and he published a paper on Schumpeter's theory of innovation (Sweezy 1943, 96). Sweezy (1942b) also challenged the views expressed in James Burnham's *The Managerial Revolution* (1941) by pointing out that most of the largest non-financial corporations are ownership controlled. Later, drawing on Sweezy (1939b), he emphasized that a U.S. (capitalist)

ruling class is welded together by a massive network of institutional and personal relations and corporations (Sweezy 1951b).

During the Second World War, Sweezy was first assigned to the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) and in 1943 sent to London and Paris and Wiesbaden. Subsequently, he was sent to Berlin, where he had frequent contacts with Paul A. Baran, whom he had met for the first time in October 1939, when Baran was completing his graduate studies at Harvard University. Sweezy's Marxist convictions and his articles (1937, 1938a, 1938b, 1943), although published in top-rated academic economic journals made him unwelcome at Harvard University because he was critical of mainstream economics.

In 1949, he founded with Leo Huberman *Monthly Review: An Independent Socialist Magazine*, that quickly gained a solid reputation both in the United States and internationally and the magazine laid the foundation for an important school of contemporary Marxist thought. Sweezy was subpoenaed twice in 1954 during an investigation by the New Hampshire Attorney General of “subversive activities.” He refused to answer questions, declared in contempt of court, and briefly imprisoned for his silence. He filed the first federal lawsuit regarding “academic freedom” in the United States and he won on appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court in 1957.

Sweezy's views on economic stagnation began to evolve during the 1950s and 1960s, particularly while collaborating with Baran on their book *Monopoly Capital* (Baran and Sweezy 1966). The main argument put forward in Baran and Sweezy (1966) is that the monopoly capitalist system is confronted with a rising economic surplus, which generates a tendency toward economic stagnation. Instead of spending the surplus on capital accumulation, it is increasingly spent on unproductive activities, such as commerce, sales promotion and publicity, armaments spending, and imperialism, and so on. Later, Harry Magdoff and Sweezy (1987) argued that this stagnation tendency also leads to an influx of surplus capital into speculative financial activities; thus, stressing the fundamental contradiction that in the short term “financialization” promotes economic growth, but in the long term generates greater economic instability and uncertainty.

Apart from his economic and historical contributions to Marxist economic theory,

Sweezy's further contributions to Marxist theory are threefold. First, on the relationship between the so-called base and superstructure in Marx's writings, Sweezy disagreed with the deterministic interpretation of Marx's "Preface" to *Contribution to a Critique of Political Economy* (1859) and only found validity for this schema for understanding the development of capitalism itself, not for every mode of production (Sweezy 1981, 22–3). Second, Sweezy stated that the working class in the "center" of the capitalist world has been transformed into a reformist force in contrast to the revolutionary movements on the "periphery," which he considered as proletarian (Sweezy 1981, 87–9). Third, post-revolutionary societies are not in a transition from capitalism to communism, but "state societies" with a ruling stratum (Sweezy 1981, 95–6). These societies and their "ruling stratum," which derives its power and privileges not from ownership of the means of production, but from its control of the state, were analysed in detail in a series of articles on the Soviet Union and China (Sweezy 1980).

Sweezy supported China's economic development strategy in contrast to that of the Soviet Union in the 1920s and 1930s. He also supported the Maoist Cultural Revolution, which he saw as the class struggle of the Chinese workers and their allies against the political elites and the bureaucracy. Sweezy concluded that a socialist society is a class-divided society that can move forward, but also backward, depending on the fortunes of the class struggle. He looked at the results of the Cuban Revolution with similar sympathy. He visited Cuba several times and wrote on the Cuban Revolution (Huberman and Sweezy 1960, 1969), stressing the achievements of the revolution in fields of education, health and the economy.

LUDO CUYVERS

References

- Baran, Paul A. and Sweezy, Paul M. 1966. *Monopoly Capital*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Burnham, James. 1941. *The Managerial Revolution*. New York: The John Day Company.
- Chamberlin, Edward. 1933. *Theory of Monopolistic Competition*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Foster, John B. 2004. "The Commitment of an Intellectual – Paul M. Sweezy (1910–2004)." *Monthly Review* 56, no. 5 (October): 5–39.
- Gilbert, Richard V., George H Hildebrand, Jr.; Arthur W. Stuart, Yapple Maxine Sweezy, Paul M. Sweezy, Lorie Tarshis, and John D. Wilson. 1938. *An Economic Program For American Democracy*. New York: Vanguard Press.
- Huberman, Leo and Paul M. Sweezy. 1960. *Cuba: Anatomy of a Revolution*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Huberman, Leo and Paul M. Sweezy. 1969. *Socialism in Cuba*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Magdoff, Harry and Paul M. Sweezy. 1987. *Stagnation and the Financial Explosion*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Robinson Joan. 1933. *Economics of Imperfect Competition*. London: Macmillan and Co.
- Sweezy, Paul M. 1933. "A Note on Relative Shares." *Review of Economic Studies*, 1, no. 1 (October): 67–8.
- Sweezy, Paul M. 1937. "On the Definition of Monopoly." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 51, no. 2 (February): 362–3.
- Sweezy, Paul M. 1938a. "Expectations and the Scope of Economics." *Review of Economic Studies* 5, no. 3 (June): 234–7.
- Sweezy, Paul M. 1938b. "The Thinness of the Stock Market." *American Economic Review* 28, no. 4 (December): 747–8.
- Sweezy, Paul M. 1939a. "Demand Under Conditions of Oligopoly." *Journal of Political Economy* 47, no. 4 (August): 568–73.
- Sweezy, Paul M. 1939b. "Appendix 13. Interest Groupings in the American Economy." In *The Structure of the American Economy*, 306–17. Washington D.C.: National Resources Committee.
- Sweezy, Paul M. 1942a. *The Theory of Capitalist Development*, London: Dennis Dobson.
- Sweezy, Paul M. 1942b. "The Illusion of the 'Managerial Revolution'." *Science & Society* 6, no. 1 (Winter): 1–23.
- Sweezy, Paul M. 1943. "Professor Schumpeter's Theory of Innovation." *Review of Economic Statistics* 25, no. 1 (February): 93–6.
- Sweezy, Paul M. 1980. *Post-Revolutionary Societies*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Sweezy, Paul M. 1981. *Four Lectures on Marxism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Albo, Gregory. 2004. "Paul Sweezy and American Marxism." *Studies in Political Economy* 74, no.1: 13–32.
- Cuyvers, Ludo. 2022. *Neo-Marxism and Post-Keynesian Economics – From Kalecki to Sraffa and Joan Robinson*. London and New York: Routledge.

Further readings

Lebowitz, Michael A. 2004. "Paul M. Sweezy."
Monthly Review 56, no. 5 (October): 40–68.

See also

Critical Political Economy; Paul A. Baran;
Marxism; Capitalist Class; Power Structure
Analysis

236. Therborn, Göran

Göran Therborn (September 23, 1941–) is a sequentially neo-Marxist and post-Marxist sociologist affiliated with the Universities of Cambridge, Gothenburg, and Nijmegen. He has published a dozen books, both qualitative and quantitative in scope, analysing the class structure of modern societies with an emphasis on the critical role of ideology for socially reproducing stratifications, hierarchies, hegemonic regimes, and relations of dominance.

Therborn grew up in a conservative land-owning family located in the Swedish Kalmar region. In the mid-1960s, he established his reputation as a promising leftist intellectual. He became a leading figure of the socialist magazine *Zenit* (1957–97), which circulated amongst union cadres and was not affiliated to any political party organization. This outlet would gradually transform itself as the mouthpiece of the New Left, attracting both left-wing members of the Social Democrats and the renewed Communist Party (Olofsson, 2016, 116). Therborn played a crucial role in translating and disseminating the thought of György Lukács, Louis Althusser, Jean-Paul Sartre, Ernest Mandel, and so on. In 1966, he also, in large extent, wrote the book *En ny vaster (A New Left)*, which instantaneously became a general reference for the younger generation who advocated political renewal (Olofsson and Hort, 2001, 34). As a member of the Social Democratic student club, Therborn was approached by Prime Minister Tage Erlander, but was expelled a few months later. In the beginning of the 1970s, he would obtain a doctorate at Lund University and write two early (untranslated) books on a Swedish miners' mass strike and a critique of the Frankfurt School.

During the mid-1970s, Therborn was introduced into British academic circles, thereupon starting to contribute to the journal *New Left Review*. His international academic breakthrough occurred in 1976 with the publication of *Science, Class & Society*. In this tome, Therborn reconstructs the modern scientific discipline of sociology within a historical-philosophical framework. He investigates how and when the work of authors (Auguste Comte, Emile Durkheim, Roberto Michels, Vilfredo Pareto, Talcott Parsons) and paradigms in general achieved

the status of “scientificity”; in other words when a discipline fully develops itself into a science proper, discovering a pattern of social determination within its field of analysis and theoretically producing this as a conceptual object in a systematized manner. His interdisciplinary approach reaches even further, as he also embarks on an inquiry about the scientific relationship between Marxist thought and the broader field of sociology and economics – for example, he examines how John Maynard Keynes succeeded in creating a new scientific paradigmatic outlook by undermining the older idea of perfect markets, a testimony of his interdisciplinarity. He hereby deploys, albeit showing and expanding its explanatory limitations, several Althusserian concepts: scientificity, epistemological break, the epistemological difference between philosophy and science, articulation, theoretical production and so on (Therborn 1976, 50–65). As such, Therborn proves that Marx's paradigmatic mode of analysis, which is generally called “historical materialism” (although not by Marx himself), also attained its status of “scientificity,” comparable to that of the economic or sociological discipline (Therborn 1976, 317–425). Historical materialism is, in a nutshell, a scientific theory of society. The older Marx was fully engaged in devising a concept of capital as he wished to produce an analysis of capitalism (see: Westra 2021). Therefore, he mainly focused on the socio-economic side of his theory: production and distribution of surplus, forces of production, social relations of production, and so on. But, Therborn underlines, historical materialism also comprises other facets of society, including political institutions, legal frameworks, ideological constellations, and so on.

Therborn would subsequently write another “Althusserian” book, *What Does the Ruling Class do When it Rules?* (1978). This work reflects a more political and less philosophical perspective, attempting to reappraise the historical debates on what differentiates capitalism from socialism or feudalism. This tome presents a systematized presentation of different types of economic class dominations, political rule, and ideological hegemony. He starts from European medieval times to “actually existing socialist” regimes in the USSR and China. Again, he adds several novel concepts to the initial Althusserian conceptual toolbox: processes

of transformation or input mechanisms and output flows. For Therborn, capitalism is being characterized by a specific set of economic relations – a minority class monopolizing the social surplus – which structures the form and functioning of the state apparatuses, and in which the dominant economic forces intervene in the reproduction of state power without immediately controlling these apparatuses – the dominant economic class rather ideologically delineates the “basic parameters of state action” (Therborn 1978, 168).

From the early 1980s onward, Therborn would depart, more or less, from adherence to the Althusserian framework. He becomes a “post-Marxist,” although he is not persuaded by its cultural turn or poststructuralist tendencies. Rather, besides his extensive quantitative work on the social and economic state of contemporary capitalism, he would invest much energy in carving out his own theory of ideology. Therborn generally believes that Althusser was too deterministic in economic terms for his explanation of the functioning of ideology, but, contra Ernesto Laclau, he continues to emphasize that taking into account class relations is indispensable for understanding ideological dynamics (Therborn 1980, 25). With the failure of the Soviet system and the relative decline of industrial manufacturing in the West, “the future relevance of the Marxian dialectic”

should be thought anew (Therborn 2008, 109).

JELLE VERSIEREN

References

- Olofsson, G. and Hort, S. 2001. “A Portrait of the Sociologist as a Young Rebel: Göran Therborn 1941–1981.” In *Class, Sex and Revolutions: A Critical Appraisal of Göran Therborn*, edited by Gunnar Olofsson and Sven Hort, 19–51. Lund: Arkiv förlag & tidskrift.
- Olofsson, G. 2016. “Tidskriften Zenits bokutgivning 1968–1982.” *ARKIV. Tidskrift för Samhällsanalys* (6): 109–31.
- Therborn, G. 1976. *Science, Class & Society: On the Formation of Sociology and Historical Materialism*. London: New Left Books.
- Therborn, G. 1978. *What Does the Ruling Class do When it Rules? State Apparatuses and State Power under Feudalism, Capitalism and Socialism*. London: New Left Books.
- Therborn, G. 1980. *The Ideology of Power and the Power of Ideology*. London: New Left Books.
- Therborn, G. 2008. *From Marxism to Post-Marxism?* London: Verso.
- Westra, R. 2021. *Economics, Science and Capitalism*. London: Routledge.

See also

Ideology; Marxism (Structural); Post-Marxism; Theories of the State

237. Torres, Rodolfo D.

Rodolfo D. Torres (b. June 7, 1949–) is Professor of Urban Political Economy in the Department of Planning and Public Policy at the University of California, Irvine, where he also serves as Director of the Latino Urban Theory Lab. Torres has a long-standing interest in cultural political economy, metropolitan economic restructuring, Mexican American labor, radical urbanism, and Marxist traditions of state theory, race, and class analysis. He is the author or editor of more than 15 books and 100 book chapters and articles.

Torres was born and raised in East Los Angeles by a single working-class mother of five children. Torres dropped out of high school at the age of 18 to join the U.S. Army and after being discharged early he entered East Los Angeles Community College. He was subsequently accepted into a Veterans honors program at UCLA, where he completed a 20-week intensive academic program. As a result of completing the honors program, Torres was admitted to the University of California, Irvine, without a high school diploma, where he graduated in 1974 with honors in social science and comparative culture. Torres went on to earn a Ph.D. in Public Policy and Administration at Claremont Graduate School.

Torres was introduced to Marxist theory during his graduate studies while a visiting student at the University of California, Riverside's program in heterodox economics, where he studied with Howard Sherman and Matthew Edel. This introduction to Marxist theory fused with Torres' political interests as he had been an active member of the Democratic Socialists of America and has remained active in DSA for more than 40 years. Torres brings a deep commitment to the application of class analysis to understanding racialization and racism, ethnicization, migration, education and urban dislocation and, cumulatively, Torres' body of work conveys the message that he does not see any strict line between his political-economic and academic engagements. As a student activist in the 1970s and 80s he engaged in political activities to support the United Farmworkers Union and he played a pivotal role in advocating for and building Ethnic Studies programs in the United States, particularly the Chicano Studies programs at East Los

Angeles Community College, California State University Hayward, California State University Long Beach, and the University of California, Irvine.

Torres' early public and academic impact was forged through a number of high-profile articles in newspapers and journals following the Los Angeles Riots of 1992. In a *Los Angeles Times* article penned with journalist Victor Valle, titled, "Enough of the Great Melodrama of Race Relations in Los Angeles" (*LA Times*, December 6, 1992), the authors argued that reliance on race categories in labeling issues raised by the rioters, and identifying the riots as a race-relations problem obfuscated the deep underlying economic inequalities that needed to be addressed in response to social unrest. This article led to a publishing contract with University of Minnesota Press for *Latino Metropolis* (2000). The book transcended established disciplines; it was widely reviewed and critically acclaimed as a landmark text that is still considered a foundational work in the study of Latino urban life.

Torres' critical commitment underpinned his work with Edward Martin (2004) and Antonia Darder (2004), particularly in the field of education. He edited the books, *Latino Education* with Darder and Henry Gutierrez (1997, 2013 2nd edn) and *The Critical Pedagogy Reader* with Darder and Marta Baltodano (2017), which is now in its third edition. These books have been widely adopted in teacher training programs and in graduate and undergraduate programs throughout the world. However, Torres has not followed the "culture turn" route taken by prominent Marxists such as Stuart Hall. With Robert Miles, Torres mounted an early critique of the Foucauldian positions adopted by many critical scholars. He argued that while racialization is a useful concept, these scholars' use of "race as power" obscured the emancipatory promise of class politics (Miles and Torres 2018). The turn to culture and the Foucauldian shift, he later argued with Christopher Kyriakides, was symptomatic of a deep-rooted social, theoretical, and political pessimism among critical scholars who were relinquishing the possibility of making a better world (Kyriakides and Torres 2012). Torres' embrace of emancipatory aspiration as a way into racialized class analysis has been a guiding force in his support for early career scholars through his co-authored

publications with them. For instance, *Man of Fire* (2013) was written with Armando Ibarra as a tribute to the vision and intellectual imagination of labor activist and scholar Ernesto Galarza (1905–84). This book won the Choice Book Award as Academic Title of the Year 2013. *The Latino Question* (2018) with Armando Ibarra and Alfredo Carlos was a key intervention aimed at delineating “the next left.”

CHRISTOPHER KYRIAKIDES

References

- Darder, Antonia, Rodolfo D. Torres, and Henry Gutierrez, eds. 1997. *Latinos and Education: A Critical Reader*.
- Darder, Antonia and Rodolfo D. Torres. 2004. *After Race: Racism After Multiculturalism*. New York: New York University Press.
- Darder, Antonia, Rodolfo D. Torres and Marta Baltodano, eds. 2017. *The Critical Pedagogy Reader*, 3rd edn. New York: Routledge.
- Ibarra, Armando, Alfredo Carlos, and Rodolfo D. Torres. 2018. *The Latino Question: Politics, Labouring Classes and the Next Left*. Pluto Press.
- Ibarra, Armando and Rodolfo, D. Torres. 2013. *Man of Fire: Selected Writings of Ernesto Galarza*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Kyriakides, Christopher and Rodolfo, D. Torres. 2012. *Race Defaced: Paradigms of Pessimism, Politics of Possibility*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Martin, Edward J. and Rodolfo D. Torres. 2004. *Savage State: Welfare Capitalism and Inequality*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Miles, Robert and Rodolfo D. Torres. 2018. “Does Race Matter? Transatlantic Perspectives on Racism after ‘Race Relations’.” In *Race and Racialization: Essential Readings*, 2nd edn, edited by Tania Das Gupta, Carl E. James, Chris Andersen, Grace-Edward Galabuzi, Roger C. A. Maaka, 96–112. Toronto: Canadian Scholar Press.
- Valle, Victor M. and Rodolfo D. Torres. 1992. “Enough of the Great Melodrama of Race Relations in Los Angeles.” *Los Angeles Times*, Sunday Opinion Section, December 6.
- Valle, Victor M. and Rodolfo D. Torres. 2000. *Latino Metropolis*. University of Minnesota Press.

See also

Latino Politics; Critical Race Theory; Intersectionality

238. Ture, Kwame

Kwame Ture (born Stokely Standiford Churchill Carmichael) (1941–98) was Chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), a chief proponent of the Black Power movement, and revolutionary Pan-Africanist. Ture, who was also known as Stokely Carmichael, shifted the course of the civil rights movement and markedly contributed to the development of African American consciousness. Ture was born in Port-of-Spain, Trinidad and Tobago, on June 29, 1941, to Mabel “May” Charles Carmichael, a Panamanian native, and Adolphus Carmichael, a Trinidadian carpenter.

In June 1952, six months after the death of Ture’s grandmother, he and some relatives moved to South Bronx, New York to join his parents and two sisters. A few months later, Ture and his family relocated to an Italian American neighbourhood. After passing the laborious entrance exam, Ture enrolled in the prestigious Bronx High School of Science. It was at Bronx High School of Science, where Ture met Gene Dennis, the son of Eugene Dennis Sr., a high-level operative of the Communist Party U.S.A., who introduced Ture to the writings of European radical thinkers such as Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, and Vladimir Lenin, which deepened his understanding and commitment to political struggle.

In 1960, Ture enrolled at Howard University, a historically Black university in Washington, D.C., where he joined the Nonviolent Action Group (NAG), the campus affiliate of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). While attending Howard, Ture organized and participated in sit-ins and protests and in 1961 he joined the Freedom Rides, organized by the Congress of Racial Equity (CORE), a civil rights collective. It was during the Freedom Rides that Ture experienced his first arrest in Hinds County, Mississippi, after which he was moved to Parchman Penitentiary.

After completing his philosophy degree in 1964, Ture returned to Mississippi, the place that “crystallized [his] politics, opened up [his] eyes, and taught [him] how to organize” (Carmichael and Thelwell 2003, 277), as a full-time organizer for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee

(SNCC). Ture served as the director of the Second Congressional District of Mississippi where he spearheaded the summer voter registration. After the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party’s inability to unseat the all-white Mississippi delegation at the Democratic National Convention in favour of themselves, Ture alongside his comrades in the struggle regrouped to restore order in “what was almost a vacuum” (Carmichael and Thelwell 2003, 425). Although Ture maintained strong relationships with the members of SNCC, he became increasingly doubtful of the changing landscape of the organization that was moving in the direction of a hierarchical bureaucracy away from SNCC’s grassroots beginnings. In 1965, Ture and SNCC members left Mississippi to Lowndes County, Alabama, a primarily Black, poor county, where he helped to organize the Lowndes County Voter League, an all-Black political party, later to be known as the Black Panther Party.

In 1966, Ture became chairman of SNCC and was now thrust into the national media limelight. On June 5, 1966, just before the Meredith Mississippi “March Against Fear,” Ture was arrested and jailed. Upon his release on bail on June 16, Ture, who had been arrested more than two dozen times previously, publicly expressed his anger and frustration in a speech where he reechoed the centuries-old demand for “Black Power” in Greenwood, Mississippi. While “Black Power!” was not an entirely new concept or slogan at the time, Ture’s speech propelled it into the spotlight, which emerged out of a growing sense of anger and frustration within the Black community, particularly amongst young African American civil rights activists and poor urban Black families across the country.

Due to Ture’s hypervisibility in the public and white national media, his speeches triggered intense surveillance by the Counterintelligence Program (COINTELPRO) of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). Ture was targeted as a threat to the national security of the United States as he was dubbed a “Black militant.” Despite this surveillance, Ture continued to deliver hundreds of speeches fighting for the reclamation of Black humanity, Black self-determination, and the political and economic power of Black communities.

In the spring of 1967, Ture stepped down from SNCC to “go back to what [he] did best, grassroot organizing” and was succeeded by H. Rap Brown (later known as Jamil Abdullah Al-Amin) (Carmichael and Thelwell 2003, 564). After relinquishing his position at SNCC, Ture made controversial trips to Cuba, China, North Vietnam, Algeria, and later to Guinea meeting the heads of state in revolutionary countries. It was in Guinea where Ture was introduced to Ghana’s President, Kwame Nkrumah, by Madame Du Bois, who later asked Ture to become his political secretary. That same year, Ture returned to the United States where under the direction of Nkrumah, he began to lay the foundation for the All-African People’s Revolutionary Party connecting Black Power to the Pan-African struggle. During this time, Ture accepted the invitation to become the honorary prime minister of the Oakland-based Black Panther Party, despite fundamental differences in ideology and organizational style. After Ture’s reacquaintance with South African singer Miriam Makeba in Guinea, in 1968, in a civil ceremony at New York’s City Hall, Ture married Makeba and later established permanent residence in Conakry, Guinea.

In 1978, Stokely Carmichael changed his name to Kwame Ture to honour his political fathers, Kwame Nkrumah, and Ahmed Sékou Touré. In 1979, Makeba and Ture divorced, and in 1980 Ture married Marliatou

Barre, a Guinean physician. They later had a son together, Boubacar Biro, named after a Guinean revolutionary who led an uncompromising war of resistance against French colonialism. In 1996, Ture was diagnosed with terminal prostate cancer and died on November 15, 1998, in Conakry, Guinea. Today, Ture’s Socialist Pan-African vision remains instrumental in African revolutionary thinking of self-reliance and self-determination that offers a possibility of total liberation and true freedom.

BEATRICE ANANE-BEDIAKOH

References

- Carmichael, Stokely. 1971. *Stokely Speaks: Black Power Back to Pan-Africanism*. New York: Random House.
- Carmichael, Stokely and Charles V. Hamilton. 1967. *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Carmichael, Stokely and Ekwueme Michael Thelwell. 2003. *Ready for Revolution: The Life and Struggles of Stokely Carmichael (Kwame Ture)*. New York: Scribner’s.

See also

Critical	Race	Theory;	Colonialism;
Neo-colonialism;		Internal	Colonialism;
Decolonization			

239. Wallerstein, Immanuel

Immanuel Wallerstein (September 28, 1930–August 31, 2019) was a professor of sociology, who exerted his greatest influence on critical political science as the originator of world-systems analysis. Wallerstein was born in New York City just prior to its rise as the “capital” of the modern world-system and it played a central role in his intellectual development. Wallerstein described himself as a “complete New Yorker” who was transfixed by the ideological and cultural diversity of the city. In addition to representing American dominance in the world, NYC would also become home to the United Nations (Rojas 2012, 4). Wallerstein’s friendships and love of languages left him open to experiencing other places. When he was a child, the world came to him. As an adult, he went to the world.

Wallerstein earned his bachelor’s degree at Columbia University in 1951 and was then drafted into the Korean War. Upon his return to NYC, Wallerstein earned an M.A. (1954) and Ph.D. (1959) at Columbia University. He was on the faculty of Columbia University from 1958–71, where he wrestled with questions of social science and contemporary politics, especially how established scholarly views were often at odds with the phenomena they purported to explain. In formulating new interpretations of the world, Wallerstein was a contrarian in social science (a “heretic,” as he once put it) (Williams 2013, 207). In the 1950s, Wallerstein was a supporter of world federalism to secure international peace as well as justice for the emerging postcolonial world. One study sought to explain a problem familiar to readers today: the irrationality of America’s Far Right, or, what he and C. Wright Mills called “practical conservatism” (Williams 2020, 19–22). Immersed in the ideas of the New York intellectuals, including Mills and Richard Hofstadter (the latter of whom also cited Wallerstein’s work), he stayed attuned to ideology and the rhetoric of power (e.g., Wallerstein 2006).

In 1968, Wallerstein was one of the faculty engaged in shuttle diplomacy during student protests and occupation of campus buildings. He facilitated negotiations between students and the administration, and worked, accord-

ing to one account, to the point of “complete exhaustion” to devise a resolution (Avorn et al. 1968, 175–6). Wallerstein sympathized with the students’ desire for a just society. He later saw the worldwide social revolts as interconnected, *antisystemic movements*, whose participants rejected the established social order.

Wallerstein’s main research emphasis throughout this period, however, was the political and economic development of Africa’s new nation-states. At the time, social scientists tended to conceptualize economic and political development in strictly national terms. The developmental trajectories of individual nations were attributed to a nation’s “civic culture” or the decisions of its leaders to implement liberal-democratic economic and political reforms (Rostow 1960; Almond and Coleman 1960; Almond and Verba 1963; Pye 1966). Yet, as Wallerstein and others noticed, this perspective on *modernization* did not account for the constant meddling of Great Powers in the affairs of the postcolonial world. Postcolonial nations could not follow the paths of European nations, he concluded, because the two groups created state institutions under different circumstances. As a result of his critical insights and leadership, Wallerstein was elected President of the African Studies Association in 1973.

In the 1970s, Wallerstein formulated an alternative way of seeing world politics called “world-systems analysis” that accounted for the interactions of various states over time in the context of a world capitalist system (1974a [2011a], 1974b). Wallerstein’s concept of a world capitalist system challenged the dominant trend in mainstream social science in two major ways. First, Wallerstein insisted there was not intellectual value in discussing social (Parsons 1951) and political (Easton 1953) systems at the level of abstract general theory, but instead one had to historically and concretely specify the system being analysed by social scientists. In the contemporary era, the world-system is a *capitalist* system. Second, Wallerstein challenged mainstream development and modernization theory by arguing that the capitalist system was an expanding world-system and that one could not understand the development or underdevelopment of individual nation-states outside the dynamics and asymmetrical interrelationships among states within that world-system. He showed how seemingly independent states

were deeply interconnected via capitalism and the activities of Great Powers (e.g., Great Britain, France, Spain, United States).

Thus, Wallerstein advocated for an alternative unit of analysis to the nation-state called the *world-system*, which encompassed the various states and their economic and cultural linkages. Wallerstein argued that scholarly writings about development should be about the development of the whole world-system rather than individual nation-states. For him, the *capitalist world-economy* began in Europe and the Americas in the sixteenth century and, over time expanded to encompass the entire globe. Its division of labor mirrored those of national social classes, with most of the world's people living in the marginalized *periphery*, some in the *semi-periphery*, and a select few in the wealthy *core*.

In 1976, Wallerstein accepted an offer to direct the Fernand Braudel Center for the Study of Economics, Historical Systems, and Civilization at Binghamton University in New York, where he worked for nearly three decades. Wallerstein's *world-systems analysis* caught on among radical anti-capitalist thinkers in the social sciences, especially those in the periphery who experienced the effects of postcolonial underdevelopment. For those who wanted to change the order and not merely rationalize it, the tradition proved to be an effective lens from which to view the world.

Wallerstein wrote about several aspects of the modern world-system. He made the most significant contributions in four areas: the rise and fall of great (hegemonic) powers; geographic expansion of the world-economy and its contemporary crisis; liberalism as rhetorical justification for capitalism; and, the idea of TimeSpace. Wallerstein came to regard the latter idea as his most important. For him, the unity of space and time was based on the notion that all systems, social and natural, are impermanent. Over their lives, systems can thrive for a time, but, as they do, they become increasingly entropic. Eventually, with few opportunities to perpetuate themselves, systems fall apart under the weight of their contradictions.

Despite the ascendancy of neoliberal politics, Wallerstein remained confident in the end of capitalism. After its passing, the dreams symbolized by 1968 could become

a reality in the form of justice, equality, and a democratic society. On the other hand, he thought regressive forces stood an equal chance of success. But Wallerstein accepted those odds, which represented a real opportunity for a more egalitarian world-system.

GREGORY P. WILLIAMS

References

- Almond, Gabriel A. and Sidney Verba. 1963. *Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Almond, Gabriel and James S. Coleman, eds. 1960. *Politics of the Developing Areas*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Avorn, Jerry L. 1968. *Up Against the Ivy Wall*. New York: Atheneum.
- Easton, David. 1953. *The Political System: An Inquiry into the State of Political Science*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Parsons, Talcott. 1951. *The Social System*. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.
- Pye, Lucien. 1966. *Aspects of Political Development; An Analytic Study*. Boston, Little, Brown.
- Rojas, Carlos Antonio Aguirre. 2012. "The World-Systems Analysis Perspective." In *Uncertain Worlds: World-Systems Analysis in Changing Times*, edited by Immanuel Wallerstein, Carlos Antonio Aguirre Rojas, and Charles Lemert, 1–100. London and New York: Routledge.
- Rostow, W. W. 1960. *Stages of Economic Growth, a Non-Communist Manifesto*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1974a [2011a]. *The Modern World-System I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1974b. "The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System: Concepts for Comparative Analysis." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 16, no. 4: 387–415.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2006. *European Universalism: The Rhetoric of Power*. New York: The New Press.
- Williams, Gregory P. 2013. "Interview with Immanuel Wallerstein: Retrospective on the Origins of World-Systems Research." *Journal of World-Systems Research* 19, no. 2: 202–10.
- Williams, Gregory P. 2020. *Contesting the Global Order: The Radical Political Economy of Perry Anderson and Immanuel Wallerstein*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Further readings

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2011b. *Historical Capitalism with Capitalist Civilization*, 2nd edn. London: Verso.

See also

World-Systems Analysis; Marxism; Samir Amin; Neocolonialism; Dependency Theory

240. Wallis, Victor

Victor Wallis (b. 1938) grew up in New York City, having been brought there from France in 1940. He was educated in private schools and received an A.B. in history from Harvard (1960), M.A. in history of ideas from Brandeis (1963), and Ph.D. in political science from Columbia (1970), majoring in comparative and Latin American politics. He spent a year as a Fulbright student in Chile (affiliated with the Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales, 1966–67), and writing a dissertation on “Foreign Investment and Chilean Politics.” His principal teaching positions in political science were at St. Lawrence University (1968–70), Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis (1970–94), and the Berklee College of Music in Boston (1996–present). He was Resident Director of the Indiana/California Program in Lima, Peru in 1982–83 and director of the International Honors Program in Europe for the fall semester of 1987. He was a resident scholar at the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington DC in the spring of 1988. He has participated since 1996 in the work of the Berlin-based multi-volume *Historical-Critical Dictionary of Marxism*, joining in several of their annual workshops and writing seven dictionary entries. He lectured in Argentina, Brazil, and Peru in 2006 and at several Chinese universities in 2016 and 2018.

His political activism initially targeted U.S. imperialism, first (beginning in 1960) in opposition to Washington’s intervention in Cuba, and later, in opposition to the U.S. invasion and bombardment of Vietnam. He was a member of the New University Conference from 1969 until its demise in 1972. In that same period, he joined the Caucus for a New Political Science, and in 1975 was appointed to chair a four-member “Committee on Structure” formed by the CNPS in part to more precisely define its own mission and in part to propose radical changes in the American Political Science Association. His report and accompanying analysis (“Putting ‘New Political Science’ Back into the Caucus”) were published in the Autumn 1975 issue of *A New Political Science* (the CNPS Newsletter). The report called for the Caucus to move increasingly toward an explicitly anti-capitalist position,

arguing that a positive political vision could enhance its effectiveness within the APSA. In 1977, Wallis was elected to a one-year term as Chairperson of the Caucus. In that capacity, he edited two issues of the NPS newsletter and appointed a committee of graduate students that transformed the newsletter into the full-scale journal *New Political Science*, which first appeared in 1979. He has remained on the NPS editorial board ever since, contributing occasional articles and reviews.

Wallis’s activism outside the academy continued with his move to Indianapolis. He helped organize a local response to the 1973 military coup in Chile and after 1979 he spoke widely over local media and throughout central Indiana about the U.S. role in El Salvador, Nicaragua (where he spent four weeks in 1984), and Grenada. He also worked on local issues, especially regarding prisons – beginning in 1974 with a study group of former prisoners and a newsletter about prison abuses, and continuing over the years with support work for prisoners involved in political education and organizing. In 1978 he joined the New American Movement, of which he remained an at-large member until its dissolution in 1981. During the 1980s, he participated in the work of the New York-based Wellspring Fund, which supported projects that integrated working-class organizing with environmental and cultural projects. Since 2011, he has worked with the online multi-issue activist organization RootsAction.org.

His writing has spanned numerous topics. “Imperialism and the ‘Via Chilena’” (1974) applied major findings of his dissertation to an analysis of how the Allende government was undermined. His Latin American interests drew him into writing several film reviews over the decades for the media journal *Jump Cut* (ejumpcut.org). The Chilean experience of worker control also led him to a wider study of that topic which was first published in 1978 but expanded and revised into the 2011 book-chapter. With his 1990 essay on the collapse of the Soviet bloc, Wallis began his collaboration with *Socialism and Democracy*, of which he became the managing editor for twenty years beginning in 1997. His own writing increasingly centered on the environmental crisis, beginning with his 1992 *Monthly Review* article, adding numerous articles over the years in *Capitalism, Nature,*

Socialism (such as “Toward Ecological Socialism” [2001], which has been translated into Chinese, French, German, Japanese, Turkish, and Portuguese), and culminating in his 2018 book, *Red-Green Revolution*. He also wrote articles for both *Monthly Review* and *New Political Science* addressing the history and prospects of the U.S. Left. These are incorporated, along with other writings, into his 2020 book, *Socialist Practice*. His 2015 article on intersectionality, of which a revised version appears in *Red-Green Revolution*, seeks to bridge the divide between Marxism and “new social movement” theorizing; it has so far been translated into French and German. His 2018 lecture series in China allowed him to give a concise overview of U.S. society and politics; it forms the basis for his book *Democracy Denied*.

CHRIS AGEE

References

- Wallis, Victor. 1974. “Imperialism and the ‘Via Chilena’.” *Latin American Perspectives* 1, no. 2: 44–57.
- Wallis, Victor. 1990. “Marxism in the Age of Gorbachev.” *Socialism and Democracy* 6, no. 2: 47–73.
- Wallis, Victor. 1992. “Socialism, Ecology, and Democracy: Toward a Strategy of Conversion.” *Monthly Review* 44, no. 2 (June): 1–22.
- Wallis, Victor. 2011. “Workers’ Control and Revolution.” In *Ours to Master and to Own: Workers’ Control from the Commune to the Present*, edited by Immanuel Ness and Dario Azzellini, 10–31. Chicago: Haymarket.
- Wallis, Victor. 2015. “Intersectionality’s Binding Agent: The Political Primacy of Class.” *New Political Science* 37, no. 4 (November): 604–19.
- Wallis, Victor. 2018. *Red-Green Revolution: The Politics and Technology of Ecosocialism*. Toronto: Political Animal Press.
- Wallis, Victor. 2019. *Democracy Denied: Five Lectures on U.S. Politics*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.
- Wallis, Victor. 2020. *Socialist Practice: Histories and Theories*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wallis, Victor. 2021. “Technology and Ecosocialism.” *Perspectives on Global Development and Technology* 20 (March): 13–29.

See also

Socialism and Democracy

241. West, Cornel

Cornel R. West (b. Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1953–present) is an American philosopher, university professor, public intellectual, political activist, and democratic socialist. His theory, practice, and vision of the good society are informed and inspired by his abiding identification with the black prophetic Christian tradition's affirmation of the values of love, justice, and the dignity of all persons. West has held academic posts at Harvard University, Princeton University, Union Theological Seminar, Dartmouth College, Pepperdine University, and the University of Paris. He has authored and co-authored numerous books, essays, and articles on topics ranging from Marxism, capitalism, racism, imperialism, pragmatism, liberation theology, and Left political strategy to architecture, postmodernism, critical legal studies, art criticism, literature, and hip-hop music. He is among the most frequently cited and interviewed intellectuals in the United States.

Drawing from Antonio Gramsci's concept of the organic intellectual, West developed his own concept of the critical organic catalyst who advances radical analyses of the social, political, economic, and cultural causes of suffering; stimulates critical thinking, moral reflection, and existential commitment to fight against oppression; and participates actively with organizations and movements to build a society that provides the material resources for all persons to flourish. As a professor, public speaker, and cultural commentator, West invites his listeners to engage in Socratic reflection – or *paideia* – on the meaning of their lives and to embrace the value of living in service to others. West's efforts reflect his commitment to highlight and develop the ethical dimensions and cultural bases of political engagement. He participates in movements like Black Lives Matter, the Poor People's Campaign and supports candidates in electoral politics, including Bernie Sanders' presidential runs, and the advance of independent parties like the Green Party and People's Party.

In his first major publication, *Prophesy Deliverance! An Afro-American Revolutionary Christianity* (1982), essays published in *Prophetic Fragments* (1988) and in *Prophetic Thought in Postmodern Times: Beyond Eurocentrism and Multiculturalism* (1993a),

as well as *Democracy Matters: Winning the Fight Against Imperialism* (2004) and *Black Prophetic Fire* (2014), West articulates a Marxist-informed critique of capitalism, racism, militarism, and imperialism. He contends that class relations are the foundational structure that determines who possesses and exercises power in society and that real democracy must involve democratization of the means and ends of production. In *Prophetic Fragments*, West argues that class politics must be the prism through which all politics should be developed and that combating capitalism involves connecting the struggle for democracy with anti-imperialist struggles. In these works, as well as lectures and social commentaries, West critiques capitalism and advocates for a moral vision of a democratic socialist society that materially supports the equality and dignity of every person.

West came to national prominence with the publication of *Race Matters* (1993b). Written in the wake of protests that followed the acquittal of the police accused of beating Rodney King, West highlights that economic, cultural, and political factors and long-standing inequalities and racial prejudice fueled black outrage. He focuses on the psychological, spiritual, and cultural dimension of suffering. In contrast to arguments made in the works cited above, West contends that the immediate enemy to black survival is neither oppression or exploitation but nihilism: the lived experience of meaninglessness, hopelessness, and lovelessness. At the same time, a market-driven culture that fetishizes pleasure, property, and power fragments society and undercuts the public good. In response to this situation, West called for a politics of conversion, fueled by a love ethic, to instill a sense of meaning and hope for a better future and called on leaders to champion the ideals of freedom, democracy, and equality to support the formation of a freer, more democratic, and stable America. In subsequent works like *The War Against Parents: What We Can Do for America's Beleaguered Moms and Dads* (1998), co-authored with Sylvia Ann Hewlett, and *The Rich and the Rest of Us: A Poverty Manifesto* (2012), co-authored with Tavis Smiley, West and his co-authors enumerate and advocate for the implementation of liberal-progressive policy agendas to meliorate socioeconomic inequal-

ity and improve conditions of labor and life for working people.

In sum, West articulates critiques of capitalist political-economy, racism, militarism, and imperialism while supporting actions, organizations, and movements to challenge the rule of capital. He advances analyses of the cultural, moral, and psychological dimensions of suffering, and supporting policies that empower and improve conditions for ordinary working people. He continues to make substantial contributions to keeping alive Marxist-informed critiques of capitalism which foreground the impact of capital accumulation and concentrated wealth and power on society with a focus on their impact on society's most vulnerable populations. West advocates in theory and practice for solidarity among the oppressed and exploited of all colors, ethnicities, nationalities, genders, sexualities, and religions, and is critical of neoliberal articulations of intersectional identity politics. Throughout his career, West has consistently highlighted the undemocratic, anti-social, and inhumane nature of capitalism and connected struggles against racism, sexism, heterosexism, religious intolerance, xenophobia, militarism, and environmental degradation to the fight for a democratic socialist society.

MARK D. WOOD

References

- West, Cornel R. 1988. *Prophetic Fragments*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.
- West, Cornel R. 1991. *The Ethical Dimensions of Marxist Thought*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- West, Cornel R. 1992. *Prophesy Deliverance! An Afro-American Revolutionary Christianity*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.
- West, Cornel R. 1993a. *Prophetic Thought in Postmodern Times: Beyond Eurocentrism and Multiculturalism*. Monroe, Maine: Common Courage Press.
- West, Cornel R. 1993b. *Race Matters*. Boston: Beacon.
- West, Cornel R., and Sylvia Ann Hewlett. 1998. *The War Against Parents: What We Can Do for America's Beleaguered Moms and Dads*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- West, Cornel R., and Roberto Mangabeira Unger. 1998. *The Future of American Progressivism*. Boston: Beacon.
- West, Cornel R. 2004. *Democracy Matters: Winning the Fight Against Imperialism*. New York: Penguin Books.
- West, Cornel R., and Tavis Smiley. 2012. *The Rich and the Rest of Us: A Poverty Manifesto*, 2nd edn. New York: SmileyBooks.
- West, Cornel R., and Christa Buschendorf. 2014. *Black Prophetic Fire*. Boston: Beacon.
- West, Cornel R., ed. 2015. *The Radical King*. Boston: Beacon.

242. Williams, Raymond

Raymond Williams (August 31, 1921–January 26, 1988) was a writer and teacher whose studies of the relationship between literature, culture, and politics, combined with a dedication to socialist democracy, made him one of the seminal figures of the British New Left. His numerous books and articles from the 1950s through the 1980s were a major inspiration for the emerging field of cultural studies and for a Marxist inspired analytic approach that Williams called “cultural materialism.” Williams was a lifelong socialist with a deep commitment to fundamentally transforming the social order as a radical form of democracy. Born in Wales in a working-class family, he won a scholarship in 1939 to read English at Cambridge University, where he joined the Communist Party. In 1940, Williams enlisted in the British Army, a move that went against the Communist line at that time, and his party membership lapsed as a result. During World War II, he served as a tank commander. After the war, Williams received a degree from Cambridge and served as a tutor in adult education from 1946–61. During this period, he wrote books on literature and culture, as well as several novels. In 1961, he returned to Cambridge as a faculty member, where he remained until his death at age 66.

Williams did not reduce culture to ideology, as he argued that the former surpasses the latter in its resources for a critique of domination, including values drawn from pre-industrial and conservative traditions. This point informed such groundbreaking studies of English culture as *Culture and Society* (1958), *The Long Revolution* (1961), and *The Country and the City* (1973). It was in *Marxism and Literature* (1977) that Williams rejoined the Marxist tradition he had criticized in *Culture and Society* to set out his theoretical standpoint through a strenuous reworking of such inter-connected concepts as base and superstructure, hegemony, language, and culture. In this work, he described his position as “cultural materialism,” which he defined as “a theory of the specificities of material cultural and literary production within historical materialism” (Williams 1977, 5). He argued that “base” and “superstructure” had become reified concepts in Marxist discourse, and that a much more

complex and expanded notion of the base and productive activity was needed to understand culture. Consistent with this critique, Williams posited language as a material productive force that helps to constitute a whole way of life and is fully social and historical in its nature. His view of language affirmed the centrality of cultural expression and communication to social theory. For Williams, hegemonic discourses about self and society, politics and economics, must be challenged at the level of language, culture, and meaning. These challenges needed to be rooted in actual communities and real social processes if alternative and oppositional forms were to take hold in politics and society.

For Williams, drawing on Gramsci, hegemony involved relations of domination and subordination that are reproduced by a complex network of traditions, institutions, and formations. Within each, however, are contradictions and the presence of alternative and oppositional currents, as well as problems of integration between them. As he put it in an interview with *New Left Review*:

My present position ... is that however dominant a social system may be, the very meaning of its domination involves a limitation or selection of the activities it covers, so that by definition it cannot exhaust all social experience, which therefore always potentially contains space for alternative acts and alternative intentions which are not yet articulated as a social institution or even project. (Williams 1979, 252)

One way of seeing the relevance of Williams for a critical political science is by looking at the relationship of Marxism and radical democracy. Some radical democratic theorists argued that Marxism needed to be superseded as a theory of society and social transformation because of its failure to recognize and validate new subjectivities, social movements, and collective identities that emerged in advanced capitalist societies in the late twentieth century. In contrast, well before “identity politics” entered political nomenclature, Williams explored the radical potentialities of new identities and social movements based on his concept of “cultural materialism,” which articulated as a position within the Marxist tradition. He thought that the women’s, peace, and environmental

movements could contribute to the renewal of democratic socialism.

During the Thatcher years (1979–90), Williams deconstructed the concept of democracy in British discourse to demonstrate the very limited nature of its purchase on actual political life and policy-making in capitalist societies. He argued that for Britain to become an actual parliamentary democracy at least three minimal conditions would have to be met: (1) the transfer of legal sovereignty from the monarchy to the people or their elected representatives, (2) the abolition of the House of Lords and its replacement by a new elected body, and (3) the adoption of an electoral system based on a proportional distribution of votes (Williams 1989, 260–61). Williams was deeply opposed to abstract models of socialism and, consequently, he was one of the few New Left theorists to work through the possible institutional structure of a socialist society at its economic, political and cultural levels. He suggested that any movement for an alternative society needed to break with predominantly economic ways of seeing the world and replace economism with a sense of a full way of life, a “broader concept of a form of human relationships within a physical world” (Williams 1984, 266). He thought the socialisms of the future would be even more complex and variegated social forms than the societies of today. Complex educational, cultural and

decision-making institutions were necessary to secure processes of autonomy, communication, and learning that would nurture both the creative individual and common way of life that Williams championed.

JOSEPH G. PESCHEK

References

- Williams, Raymond. 1977. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 Williams, Raymond. 1979. *Politics and Letters: Interviews with New Left Review*. London: Verso.
 Williams, Raymond. 1984. *The Year 2000*. New York: Pantheon.
 Williams, Raymond. 1989. *Resources of Hope*. London: Verso.

Further readings

- Inglis, Fred. 1995. *Raymond Williams*. London and New York: Routledge.
 O'Connor, Alan. 1989. *Raymond Williams: Writing, Culture, Politics*. Oxford and New York: Blackwell.
 Peschek, Joseph. 1993. “Raymond Williams: Culture, Politics and Democracy.” *New Political Science* 14, no. 1: 17–29.

See also

- Critical Media Studies; Democracy; Hegemony; Ideology; Terry Eagleton

243. Williams, William Appleman

William Appleman Williams (June 12, 1921–March 5, 1990) was born in the small town of Atlantic, Iowa. He graduated from the US Naval Academy at Annapolis, Maryland and was a World War II veteran. Williams would go on to become one of the most influential critical scholars of U.S. foreign policy from the late 1950s until his death in Oregon in 1990. After returning from World War II, Williams considered a career in the military and went to Corpus Christi, Texas for naval flight school. In the climate of a rising civil rights movement, Williams became politically active at this time. Williams and his first wife, Jeannie Preston, even produced a newsletter for the local branch of the NAACP. Under political pressure, and with the Navy considering sending him to Bikini Atoll to practice post-atomic war games, it was discovered that Williams had recurring spinal problems due to an extra vertebra he had been born with and he was given a medical discharge from the US Navy (Buhle and Rice-Maximin 1995, 25–31).

Upon leaving the Navy, Williams went to Madison, Wisconsin to attend graduate school in history. While at Wisconsin, he would write his 1948 master's thesis, a study of the *Chicago Tribune's* perspective on Russia from 1917–21, and his 1950 Ph.D. Dissertation titled, "Raymond Robbins and Russian-American Relations 1917–1938," which examined how Robbins had worked towards rapprochement with Russia. This started Williams on the pathway of challenging Cold War propagandistic narratives of U.S. history and foreign policy, which would come to define his career.

Williams' first book, *American-Russian Relations, 1781–1947* (1952) received some public attention, but it was *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy* (1959) that established his position as a leading critic of U.S. foreign policy. Williams returned to Madison to teach in the Department of History after spending the first five years of his academic career at the University of Oregon. While at Wisconsin, Williams would become a public figure, and at the same time, contribute to building up the "Wisconsin school" of thought on U.S. history and foreign policy

by supporting graduate students such as Walter LaFeber, Lloyd Gardner, and Thomas McCormick, all of whom would become leading scholars in their own right (Buhle and Rice-Maximin 1995, 105–08).

In *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy* Williams developed the framework that would guide all of his major writings, up through his last major work, *Empire as a Way of Life* (1980). In contrast to more "isolationist" perspectives, Williams argued that from the start the United States was a world power engaged in international relations. Highlighting the long history of U.S. empire building, Williams argued that from the colonial age past the American Revolution, Americans viewed their actions through the lens of empire and saw expansion as a way to solve their problems. He suggested that this view was largely oriented by the search for export markets, which was perhaps the central driving force behind U.S. expansion and foreign policy (Williams 1972).

Williams expanded on these themes in his next major work, *The Contours of American History* (1961). Williams analysed both the history of American expansion in the context of British mercantilism to the Cold War era and he authored a detailed engagement with key ideological figures and political actors. Williams was concerned with both the material history of American empire along with its psychological side; he showed the depth of the way empire was built into U.S. history (Williams 1988). Following *The Contours of American History*, Williams continued writing books, such as *The Roots of American Empire*, which was perhaps his most thoroughly researched scholarly work, along with many essays for a public audience in, for instance, *The Nation*.

Williams left Wisconsin at the end of the 1960s to join the history department at Oregon State University, where he would teach for two decades before his retirement. He was elected to head of the Organization of American Historians in 1980 after establishing his reputation as perhaps the leading historian of U.S. foreign policy for over two decades. His legacy would not be without some controversy. His version of radicalism was highly critical of the New Left, which he viewed as overly individualistic and selfish. Rather, his version of an alternative society emphasized local communities with a high level of cooperation. Williams was

never a firm supporter of feminism, which he seemed to see as potentially harming family and community, an issue that affected his private life as well. Lastly, coming from an earlier generation, he was criticized for failing to embrace “history from below” and relying too much on the “great man” perspective on history (Buhle and Rice-Maximin 1995, 170–78).

Overall, however, Williams left a lasting impression on the fields of political science and history. His emphasis on “empire as a way of life,” the ideological foundations of American imperialism, and his interpretations of the way the search for markets drove U.S. foreign policy, along with his support for generations of students, changed the way scholars and activists have thought about, and continue to think critically about U.S. foreign policy and social life.

JAMES PARISOT

References

- Buhle, Paul, and Edward Rice-Maximin. 1995. *William Appleman Williams: The Tragedy of Empire*. New York: Routledge.
- Williams, William Appleman. 1972. *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Williams, William Appleman. 1988. *The Contours of American History*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Further readings

- Berger, Henry W., ed. 1992. *A William Appleman Williams Reader*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee.
- Williams, William Appleman. 1970. *The Roots of the Modern American Empire*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Williams, William Appleman. 1980. *Empire as a Way of Life*. New York: Oxford University Press.

244. Wolin, Sheldon

Sheldon Wolin (1922 Chicago, IL–2015 Salem, OR) grew up in Buffalo, New York during the Great Depression. He received his B.A. in Political Science from Oberlin College (1946) and his Ph.D. in Political Science from Harvard University (1950). At Oberlin, Wolin studied with Frederick B. Artz, Oszkár Jászi, and John D. Lewis. He graduated two years later than intended after serving as a navigator and bombardier during World War II, flying 51 bombing missions with the 13th Air Force in the Southwest Pacific. At Harvard, he studied with Louis Hartz, Carl Friedrich, Benjamin F. Wright, and Samuel Beer, and wrote a dissertation on eighteenth-century British Constitutionalism. After a year at Oxford University on a Fulbright scholarship upon graduation, Wolin accepted his first academic position as Assistant Professor in Political Science at Oberlin College (1950), where he remained until his appointment at the University of California, Berkeley in 1954, initially on a Rockefeller Fellowship. At Berkeley, Wolin teamed with Norman Jacobson, soon to be joined by John Schaar and later Michael Rogin and Hanna Pitkin, to form what has later been called the “Berkeley School of Political Theory.” Wolin and his colleagues trained a generation of political theorists, including Hannah F. Pitkin, J. Peter Euben, Wilson Carey McWilliams, John G. Gunnell, Harlan Wilson, Terrence Ball, Richard Ashcraft, Jeffrey Lustig, and Eldon Eisenach, who insisted on the importance of the political dimension of their discipline.

During the student movements at Berkeley in the 1960s, Wolin supported the demands of the students, and he took an active role in the “Reconstitution movement” opposing the escalation of the war in Southeast Asia. When the mobilization faded in the summer of 1970, Wolin accepted a position at the University of California, Santa Cruz, where he spent two years before moving to Princeton to head the interdisciplinary Program in Political Philosophy. By that time, Wolin had become an important voice in the field of Political Theory. After a few early articles, he published a major intervention in the history of political ideas in 1960 with his first book, *Politics and Vision* (Wolin 1960). Revisiting the history of Western political thought, the book traced the progressive demise of “the

political,” leading to a pessimistic diagnosis of the post-war settlement and “the Age of Organization” to describe the current state of American society. The book’s long-lasting influence was recognized with the Benjamin E. Lippincott Award in Political Theory in 1985, and a second, enlarged edition appeared in 2004.

In the years following the book’s initial publication, Wolin made several important interventions in the field of political theory, first co-authoring a scathing book review of the work of Leo Strauss and his students in the *American Political Science Review* (Wolin and Schaar 1963) that served as an early repudiation of Strauss’ methods and influence. In the second half of the 1960s, the two co-authors signed a series of articles examining the student movements and the modern university that were published in the *New York Review of Books* and later gathered into a small book (Wolin and Schaar 1970). Finally, in 1969, in an article entitled “Political Theory as a Vocation” (Wolin 1969), Wolin laid out a frontal attack against the rise of behaviorism in North American Political Science and what he labelled “methodism,” the dominant empirical modes of enquiry that placed a premium on the mastery of methods at the expense of approaches cultivating “tacit political knowledge,” leading to a political science embracing the status quo and devoid of critical purchase (Wolin 1969, 1070). He coined the term “epic theory” as a counter-model that would support a more politically minded theory (Wolin 1970). Wolin was also a founding member of the Caucus for a New Political Science in 1967, which endeavored to contest the dominance of behaviorism within the American Political Science Association, and he co-founded the Conference for the Study of Political Thought in 1968.

At Princeton, in the 1970s and early 1980s, Wolin trained another generation of political theorists (Cornel West, Wendy Brown, Dana Villa, Joan Tronto, Frederick Dolan, Kristie McClure, Larry George, Nicholas Xenos...), and continued his political activism within the university by supporting the disinvestment campaigns from Apartheid-ruled South Africa. Most of his publications from those years took the form of what he later labelled “political commentary,” that is, “political theory conducted by other means,” whereby the political theorist could discharge “his

public task of political education" (Wolin 1980, 163). Accordingly, Wolin regularly published in the *New York Review of Books* and *The New York Times* with the hope of engaging larger audiences. This effort was followed in 1981 by the creation of the journal *democracy*, a publication mostly written by academics, but intended to address larger audiences and to encourage forms of democratic renewal and radical change. Wolin wrote the editorials for the journal, as well as some important articles, where he revisited the American political experience (Wolin 1982) and defended a participatory, "populist" model of democracy (Wolin 1986). These themes provided the material for his second book, *The Presence of the Past* (Wolin 1989), which was published in conjunction with the bicentenary of the U.S. Constitution. By that time, Wolin had retired from Princeton in 1987.

In the early 1990s, Wolin's writings on democracy took a more pessimistic turn, describing genuine participatory moments as a necessarily rare or "fugitive" phenomena (Wolin 1994a) that were constrained by institutional apparatuses and, in particular, by constitutions (Wolin 1994b). He continued his exploration of the nature of political theory with a monumental book on Tocqueville (Wolin 2001), as well as his radical critique of the state of the U.S. political system under the hold of the "Superstate," leading to a form of "managed democracy" that risked further demobilizing the citizenry (Wolin 2008).

An acclaimed professor, Wolin embodied a critical, left-wing yet non-Marxist voice in North American Political Theory for over a half century, for whom, as he put it, political theory was "primarily a civic and secondarily an academic activity" (Wolin 1989, 1).

OLIVIER ROUCHET

References

- Wolin, Sheldon S. 1960. *Politics and Vision: Continuity and Innovation in Western Political Thought*. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.
- Wolin, Sheldon S. 1969. "Political Theory as a Vocation." *American Political Science Review* 63, no. 4: 1062–82.
- Wolin, Sheldon S. 1970. *Hobbes and the Epic Tradition of Political Theory*. Los Angeles: William Clark Andrews Memorial Library.
- Wolin, Sheldon S. 1980. "Political Theory and Political Commentary." In *Political Theory and Political Education*, edited by Melvin Richter, 190–203. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Wolin, Sheldon S. 1982. "What Revolutionary Action Means Today." *Democracy* 2, no. 4: 17–28.
- Wolin, Sheldon S. 1986. "Contract and Birthright." *Political Theory* 14, no. 2 (May): 179–93.
- Wolin, Sheldon S. 1989. *The Presence of the Past. Essays on the State and the Constitution*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Wolin, Sheldon S. 1994a. "Fugitive Democracy." *Constellations*, 1, no. 1: 11–25.
- Wolin, Sheldon S. 1994b. "Norm and Form: The Constitutionalizing of Democracy." In *Athenian Political Thought and the Reconstruction of American Democracy*, edited by Peter Euben, John R. Wallach and Josiah Ober. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Wolin, Sheldon S. 2001. *Tocqueville Between Two Worlds: The Making of a Political and Theoretical Life*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Wolin, Sheldon S. 2008. *Democracy Incorporated*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Wolin, Sheldon and John H. Schaar, 1963. "Review: Essays on the Scientific Study of Politics: A Critique." *American Political Science Review* 57, no. 1 (March): 125–50.
- Wolin, Sheldon S. and John H. Schaar. 1970. *The Berkeley Rebellion and Beyond: Essays on Politics and Education in the Technological Society*. New York: Vintage.

See also

Democracy; Richard Ashcraft; Jeffrey Lustig; Cornel West; *democracy*

245. Wright, Erik Olin

Erik Olin Wright (February 9, 1947–January 23, 2019) was an American sociologist and intellectually he was worldwide one of the most influential scholars of his generation. Wright's parents were both liberal psychology professors at the University of Kansas, where he spent his childhood. Wright was educated at Harvard (B.A. 1968), Oxford (B.A. 1970), and the University of California, Berkeley where, in 1976, he received his Ph.D. in Sociology. Wright immediately took a job as a professor of sociology at the University of Wisconsin at Madison, where he spent the rest of his life. Wright was elected President of the American Sociological Association in 2012.

Wright's social engagement began in the Unitarian Liberal Religion, although he was radicalized by the civil rights movement and the anti-Vietnam War movement. To evade the military draft, Wright enrolled in a Unitarian seminary, where he initiated a seminar on Utopia and Revolution. For a year, he was a student chaplain at San Quentin prison. Wright (2005, 335) "fell into Marxism" in the early 1970s as part of the radical student ferment in the San Francisco Bay area, where he was one of the founders of the journal *Kapitalistate*. He committed himself to Marxism, and "chose to stay" as he put it, "to declare ... [his] solidarity with struggles against capitalism, class inequality and oppression." His last book, published posthumously, was titled *How to Be An Anti-Capitalist in the Twenty-First Century* (2021). He was never an orthodox Marxist, but he was committed to "building Marxism."

Wright's large *oeuvre* is concentrated in two great research programs, where he enrolled a large number of collaborators from across the world, as well as inspiring autonomous spin-offs in several countries. Wright's first major research program was the Comparative Class Analysis Project, launched in 1978, with the original comparative frame including the USA, Italy, and Sweden. His second major research program was the Real Utopias Project, started in 1992, against the ideological headwinds of the 1990s, when anti-capitalist utopias were fading or cast away. Both programs were part of a lifetime commitment to "emancipatory

social science," which Wright understood as primarily emancipation from capitalism. The first project focused on class as the key force of liberation from capitalist exploitation. Wright's (2010, Chap. 1) second project saw "the central axis of transcending capitalism ... [in] democracy." Instead of collective forces of anti-capitalist change, this program focused on "institutions and social relations that could potentially advance the democratic egalitarian goals historically associated with the idea of socialism."

On the topic of class, Wright's major theoretical contribution were his analyses of the multidimensionality of class through concepts such as "contradictory class locations" and the existence of different class "assets," such as property, authority, and skills. His analysis emerged as a solution to the "boundary problem" in Marxist class theory of the time; namely, where to draw the line between the working class and other classes or strata of employees in capitalist societies. At the time, there was a field of competing definitions, between a broad definition that included almost all employees of capital, and a much narrower definition as manual workers in material production. Characteristically, Wright (1978, 78ff.) did not see this as an either-or problem to be decided by *fiat*, supported by one Marx quotation or another, but as an empirical ambiguity to be sorted out analytically. He distinguished positions with different amounts of control of the production process and authority over the labor of others.

Wright (1985, 51ff.) came to recognize problems with his first solution to the class boundaries problem due to the imprecise contradictoriness of the class locations and its central focus on domination, rather than exploitation. The outcome was a three-dimensional conceptualization of class in terms of "assets," means of production and their ownership or not, amounts of "organizational assets" (organizational authority), and of skills/credentials assets (Wright 1985, 86ff). Wright (1997, 16) defined exploitation "in terms of extraction and appropriation of effort," which was a key concept that pointed simultaneously to conflict of interests and to interdependence.

Wright's international series of surveys of class structure, class relations, and class consciousness included 16 countries. The results of these surveys were never summed up in their entirety, but he published several

thought-provoking comparisons of the United States, Australia, Canada, Japan, Norway, and Sweden, with portraits of different configurations of class, intersections of class and gender, and original studies of the permeability of (asset-based) class boundaries, with respect to friendship, family formation, and intergenerational mobility.

When the utopia of socialist revolution imploded in the 1990s, Wright set out to search for more credible indicators of the possibility of another world – “real” utopias. He (2010, Chap. 1) investigated and reflected on cases of non-capitalist institutions and social relations in actual existence or laid out theoretical proposals “attentive to realistic problems of institutional design and social feasibility.” His first four examples of real utopias were participatory city budgeting in Porto Alegre, Brazil, Wikipedia, the large Mondragon cooperative in Basque Spain, and unconditional basic income, which was a proposal being elaborated by Philippe van Parijs, an associate of Wright’s in the Analytical Marxism group. The program generated several trans-disciplinary books, with three books on issues of democracy – associations, participatory governance, and legislation by randomly selected assemblies – three books on markets and income; one book on family divisions of labor; and one book directly on *Alternatives to Capitalism* (2016). Wright summed up the program in *Envisioning Real Utopias* (2010) and in the half-finished posthumous *How to be an Anti-Capitalist in the Twenty-First Century* (2019). Part of the program included extensive lecture touring across the world.

Like the Class program, the Real Utopias program is embedded in the search for a transcendence of capitalism. However, in the latter vision, Wright (2010, 155) argues that “civil society is the site of a form of power with emancipatory potential – ‘social power’,” which he also refers to “associational power.” Socialism is now contrasted to “statism” as well as to capitalism by “taking the “social” in socialism seriously” (Wright 2010, 123). Wright discusses the possibilities of transcendence in an innovative theoriza-

tion of social transformation in terms of kinds of processes and strategies. He identifies three “logics of transformation,” including ruptural, interstitial, and symbiotic, with the third logic being a compromise (for the time being) that benefits both capital and workers.

Wright’s discussion of social transformation is characteristically problematizing, formally modelled, and open-ended, while mostly critical of the ruptural as both democratically dangerous and highly unlikely in developed capitalist countries. In his last book, transcending capitalism is discussed more in terms of “strategic logics,” which include smashing capitalism, escaping capitalism, resisting capitalism, taming capitalism, or (gradually) dismantling capitalism. Wright (2019, 65ff., 93ff.) was inspired by “some movements in Latin America and Southern Europe,” where he discerned the emergence of a sixth strategy that combined the four last-mentioned ones in a strategy for “eroding” capitalism in societies that already had several non-capitalist socio-economic institutions and practices.

Wright remained a committed emancipatory social scientist to the end of his life.

GÖRAN THERBORN

References

- Wright, Erik Olin. 1978. *Class, Crisis, and the State*. London: New Left Books.
- Wright, Erik Olin. 1985. *Classes*. London: Verso.
- Wright, Erik Olin. 1997. *Class Counts*. London: Verso.
- Wright, Erik Olin. 2005. “Falling into Marxism, Choosing to Stay.” In *The Disobedient Generation: Social Theorists in the 60s*, edited by Alan Sica and Stephen Turner, 325–52. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wright, Erik Olin. 2010. *Envisioning Real Utopias*. London: Verso.
- Hahnel, Robin and Erik Olin Wright. 2016. *Alternatives to Capitalism: Proposals for a Democratic Economy*. London: Verso.
- Wright, Erik Olin. 2019. *How to Be an Anti-Capitalist in the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Verso.

See also

Marxism (Analytic); Theories of the State; Class

246. Young, Iris Marion

Iris Marion Young (b. January 2, 1949–d. August 1, 2006) was a multi-dimensional thinker, with contributions ranging from reflections on body motility and gender oppression, feminist historical materialism, social (in)equality, difference and inclusion, social responsibility for justice, among many other topics (Young 1980b; 1980a; 1990; 2000; 2005; 2011). Young was born and grew up in New York City, where she graduated with a B.A. in Philosophy from Queens College. She earned an M.A. and a Ph.D. in Philosophy from Pennsylvania State University (1974). Young went on to teach at several universities, including the University of Chicago, the University of Pittsburgh, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, and Miami University. Her intellectual contributions have made a significant impact on many disciplines, but Young is commonly remembered as a feminist-socialist political theorist.

Although Young's work does not shy away from dense philosophical analysis, her career is most characterized by an acute concern with pragmatism, social justice, and the grounded experiences of individuals. Against this background, her work generated many rich insights into marginalized peoples' needs, lived experiences, and lack of justice.

Young's concern with social justice, and the different lived experiences of individuals, can be read as stemming partly from the post-Cold War political context. As explained by Mary Hawkesworth (2008, 325), discussing modes of injustice that focused only on capitalist exploitation had become increasingly difficult after the dissolution of the USSR, as alternatives to capitalism seemed impossible and ill-fated. Influenced by the women's movements of the 1970s (Young 1990, 13; Torbisco-Casals and Boran 2008, 174), Young's contributions to socialist political theory sought to revise the field by bringing consideration of the different lives, perspectives, and concerns of gender and race minorities as primary – and not just secondary – foci for a socialist critique of oppression (Young 1980a).

Young's focus on the need to account for these different modes of exclusion led her to challenge accounts of social justice that assumed a uniform identity and experience

by individuals belonging to marginalized groups. In this sense, one of Young's many significant contributions is the concept of the *politics of difference* for justice and inclusion. For the conceptualization of this term, Young (1990, 13) admits she was particularly inspired by "discussions in the women's movement of the importance and difficulty of acknowledging differences of class, race, sexuality, age, ability, and culture among women." While acknowledging that different structures of oppression categorize and subsume individuals under different social groups, she explains that these structures are nevertheless experienced differently by each person. This dual focus on structural inequality and the embodied experience of individuals vis-à-vis those structures allowed Young to move away from an essentialized and abstract view of subjectivity, social groups, and oppression. As such, her work is marked by a rejectionist stance on presuming a homogeneous life experience and consciousness for women, racial minorities, gays and lesbians, among others. This recognition added an important layer to her pragmatism, as her theory was often informed by proposals for concrete social action grounded on the complexity and plurality of human lives.

Young's late work took these considerations on the politics of difference further by developing a social-connectivity model of responsibility for justice. In this regard, while acknowledging that individuals do not hold the same responsibility in causing structural injustice, she argued that this responsibility should be shared given that it is impossible to identify who or what specifically caused an unjust outcome. She illustrates this contention by highlighting the complex and multilayered chain of production and distribution involved in maintaining sweatshop labor. In this sense, while factory owners and managers hold the most direct link with these unjust conditions of labor, the structure of the global apparel industry diffuses responsibility to several other actors, such as wholesalers, worldwide corporate retailers, state agencies, and even consumers (Young 2011, 125–34). This sharedness is what makes it a *collective duty* to transform structural injustices and to make their outcomes less unjust for oppressed populations. In light of this observation, Young (2011, 109–10) argues that

all those who contribute by their actions to the structural processes that produce injustice share responsibility for those harms. As I understand it, a shared responsibility is a responsibility I *personally* bear, but I do not bear it alone ... Thus I share with others the responsibility to transform these processes to reduce and eliminate the injustice they cause.

JULIANA SANTOS DE CARVALHO

References

- Hawkesworth, Mary. 2008. "The Pragmatics of Iris Marion Young's Feminist Historical Materialism." *Politics & Gender* 4, no. 2: 318–26.
- Torbisco-Casals, Neus, and Idil Boran. 2008. "Interview with Iris Marion Young." *Hypatia* 23, no. 3: 173–81.
- Young, Iris Marion. 1980a. "Socialist Feminism and the Limits of Dual Systems Theory." *Socialist Review* 10, no. 2/3: 169–88.
- Young, Iris Marion. 1980b. "Throwing like a Girl: A Phenomenology of Feminine Body Comportment Motility and Spatiality." *Human Studies* 3, no. 1: 137–56.
- Young, Iris Marion. 1990. *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Young, Iris Marion. 2000. *Inclusion and Democracy*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Young, Iris Marion. 2005. "House and Home: Feminist Variations on a Theme." In *Motherhood and Space*, edited by Sarah Hardy and Caroline Wiedmer, 115–47. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Young, Iris Marion. 2011. *Responsibility for Justice*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Further readings

- Ackerly, Brooke A. 2018. *Just Responsibility: A Human Rights Theory of Global Justice*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ferguson, Ann, and Mechtild Nagel. 2009. *Dancing with Iris: The Philosophy of Iris Marion Young*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- McAfee, Noëlle, and Katie B. Howard. 2009. "Feminist Political Philosophy." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, March 2009. Available at <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2022/entries/feminism-political/>.

247. Zeitlin, Maurice

Maurice Zeitlin graduated in June 1957 from Wayne State University in Detroit, where he grew up, with a B.A. in anthropology. He immediately enrolled in the Department of Anthropology at the University of California Berkeley, where he focused on the origins and evolution of the human species. The next year he transferred to Sociology to focus on historical forms of society. Under the mentorship of Reinhard Bendix, he wrote his master's thesis on the development of feudalism in Japan, which was the basis of Zeitlin's (1960) first published article on Max Weber's sociology of feudalism. With Seymour Martin Lipset as his adviser, Zeitlin wrote his dissertation on labor and politics in pre-revolutionary Cuba. He received his Ph.D. in Sociology in January 1964.

From 1961 to 1964, Zeitlin was an instructor in sociology and anthropology at Princeton University. He published four articles on the Cuban revolution in 1961, and another five articles in 1962, while also publishing an interview on September 14, 1961 with Che Guevara, the director of the Center for International Studies. In 1960, UC Berkeley graduate students Ruth Markovitz, Robert Scheer, Sol Stern, David Horowitz and Zeitlin founded *Root & Branch: A Radical Quarterly* (whose first issue included Zeitlin's interview with Che Guevara). As a result of these achievements, Klaus Knorr invited Zeitlin to become a research associate at the Center for International Studies and funded his research in Cuba during 1961 and 1962.

In July 1964, Zeitlin was appointed Assistant Professor of Sociology at the University of Wisconsin, Madison. He became a full professor in 1970. During mid-1965 through 1966, he was on leave as a Ford Foundation Research Fellow and carried out research on Chile's coal and copper miners, the peasantry, and on what he later termed the "coalesced bourgeoisie." In the fall of 1976, he joined the Department of Sociology at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) and was appointed four years later as Distinguished Professor of Sociology. Upon his retirement on November 1, 2015, he was appointed Distinguished Research Professor of Sociology. In 1971–72, he had been Visiting Professor of Political Science and Sociology at The Hebrew University of

Jerusalem, and during the winter semesters of 1996 and 1997, he was a Visiting Professor at Tel Aviv University, Israel.

Zeitlin founded and served as editor-in-chief of *Political Power and Social Theory: A Research Annual*, from 1978 through 1990, and was succeeded by Diane Davis, his former UCLA doctoral student, who by then had become the Charles Dyer Norton Professor of Regional Planning and Urbanism at Harvard's Graduate School of Design. Zeitlin served on various editorial boards, including *New Critics Press* (1969–73), *Third World Review* (1974–78), International Sociological Association (1977–81), and *The Progressive* (1985–96). He was also a Contributing Editor and Latin America editor at *Ramparts Magazine* (1967–73).

Zeitlin is the author, co-author, or editor of 15 books and over 95 peer-reviewed articles as well as seven articles for a general audience, several of which have been translated into Spanish, Portuguese, German, Swedish, Farsi, Hungarian, Romanian, and Japanese. Among his authored or co-authored books, the most well-known may be *Cuba: An American Tragedy* (1964); *Revolutionary Politics and the Cuban Working Class* (1967); *The Civil Wars in Chile* (1984); *Landlords & Capitalists: The Dominant Class of Chile*, with Richard Earl Ratcliff (1988); *Talking Union*, with Judith Stepan-Norris (1996); and *Left Out: Reds and America's Industrial Unions*, with Judith Stepan-Norris (2003). His three Princeton-published books have been re-published in the Princeton Legacy Library as part of "the distinguished back-list of Princeton University Press."

Among Zeitlin's edited books, the three most well-known may be: *Latin America: Reform or Revolution? A Reader*, with James Petras (1968); *American Society, Inc: Studies of the Social Structure and Political Economy of the United States* (1970); and *Classes, Class Conflict, and the State: Empirical Studies in Class Analysis* (1980) with 15 of the 16 chapters in the latter book written by UCLA sociology graduate students. Among his articles for a general audience, "Who Owns America? The Same Old Gang" (1978) is probably the most well-known, having been included, between its publication in 1978 and 1985, in 11 sociology anthologies, and taught to undergraduates throughout the country. It also appeared in several labor

union publications. In 1992, this essay was also published in McGraw-Hill's Primus electronic data base and it won the Project Censored Prize for one of the "Year's Ten Best Censored Stories of 1978."

A number of Zeitlin's peer-reviewed articles earned awards for distinguished scholarship; among them, the "Max Weber Award for Distinguished Scholarship" granted by the Section on Organizations, Occupations, and Work of the American Sociological Association. Zeitlin was awarded the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation Fellowship (1981–82), the Ford Foundation Fellowship in Latin American Studies (1965–67), and the Ford Foundation Faculty Fellowship (1970–71).

VICTOR WALLIS

References

- Zeitlin, Maurice. 1960. "Max Weber and the Sociology of the Feudal Order." *Sociological Review* 8 (December): 202–07.
- Zeitlin, Maurice. 1967. *Revolutionary Politics and the Cuban Working Class*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Zeitlin, Maurice, ed. 1970. *American Society, Inc: Studies of the Social Structure and Political Economy of the United States*. Chicago: Markham Publishing Co.
- Zeitlin, Maurice. 1978. "Who Owns America? The Same Old Gang." *The Progressive* 42, no. 6 (June): 14–19.
- Zeitlin, Maurice, ed. 1980. *Classes, Class Conflict, and the State: Empirical Studies in Class Analysis*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co.
- Zeitlin, Maurice. 1984. *The Civil Wars in Chile, or The Bourgeois Revolutions that Never Were*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Zeitlin, Maurice and Robert Sheer. 1963. *Cuba: An American Tragedy*. New York: Grove Press.
- Zeitlin, Maurice and Richard Earl Ratcliff. 1988. *Landlords & Capitalists: The Dominant Class of Chile*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Zeitlin, Maurice and Judith Stepan-Norris. 1996. *Talking Union*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Zeitlin, Maurice and Judith Stepan-Norris. 2003. *Left Out: Reds and America's Unions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zeitlin, Maurice and James Petras, eds. 1968. *Latin America: Reform or Revolution? A Reader*. Greenwich, CT: Fawcett Premier Books.

See also

Marxism; Class; Capitalist Class; Theories of the State

248. Zinn, Howard

Howard Zinn (b. August 24, 1922 New York City–d. January 27, 2010) was born to working-class, Jewish immigrant parents in Brooklyn, New York. While there were no books in his home, Zinn sought out political literature ranging from John Steinbeck to Karl Marx. As a teenager, he joined an anti-fascism demonstration in Times Square, where he witnessed police violence against protesters, including himself. After high school, Zinn worked as a shipyard laborer, organizing an apprentice association, and later joined the U.S. Army Air Force as a World War II bombardier. These formative experiences shaped Zinn's radicalism, including his antipathy toward capitalist exploitation, war and militarism, and U.S. imperialism. Under the G.I. bill, Zinn earned his B.A. from New York University (1951) and his Ph.D. in History from Columbia University (1958). His first publication, *La Guardia in Congress* (1959), tracked the congressional career of Fiorello LaGuardia, who Zinn saw as an "outspoken champion of social justice."

Zinn's first academic appointment was as Chair of the Department of History and Social Sciences at Spelman College (1956–63), a historically Black women's college in Atlanta, Georgia. It was here, in the epicenter of an emerging Civil Rights movement, that Zinn discovered the university as a vast resource of intellectual and political energy not to be wasted on "merely" academic pursuits. This refusal to separate teaching from activist engagement, and an insistence that education cannot be "neutral" on real world struggles, would be one of Zinn's vital contributions to critical political science. As Social Science Club advisor, Zinn was deeply involved in early student-led racial desegregation campaigns, including Atlanta's public library system, and he supported student protests against an authoritarian Spelman administration. He also served as senior advisor for the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, participating in Freedom Rides, sit-ins, picket lines, and demonstrations alongside his students, who included novelist Alice Walker, singer and historian Bernice Johnson Reagan, and Marian Wright Edelman (founder of the Children's Defense Fund).

Zinn's immersion in the southern movement for racial justice resulted in two important books, both of which reflected Zinn's growing conclusions about bottom-up action as the heartbeat of participatory democracy and political transformation. *The Southern Mystique* (1959) explored the idea of white southerners' commitment to racial prejudice as a historical pattern of behavior, rather than an intractable problem, which could be dissipated through sustained interracial contact and social solidarity. *SNCC: The New Abolitionists* (1964), the first full-length study of SNCC's indefatigable grassroots organizing, was rooted in Zinn's own participant-observation and "on the spot reportage." Holding up the relatively unknown group as the vanguards of the Black liberation movement, *SNCC* represented Zinn's early commitment to documenting "history-making" activism in the present, which might otherwise be diminished or neglected altogether.

Zinn was fired from Spelman for insubordination, which was a charge he accepted proudly. Zinn subsequently joined Boston University's Political Science Department (1964–88). At Boston University, Zinn became a fixture in the emerging anti-Vietnam war movement, organizing sit-ins, speaking at rallies, and facing arrest on numerous occasions. In his professional capacity as a historian, he served as an expert witness in civil disobedience trials, including the Pentagon Papers trial of Daniel Ellsberg and Anthony Russo. He was a central force in urging the American Historical Association to adopt an anti-Vietnam war resolution. In 1968, Zinn travelled to Hanoi with Father Daniel Berrigan, as U.S. peace movement representatives, to negotiate the release of POWs. His pathbreaking book, *Vietnam: The Logic of Withdrawal* (1967) insisted on the immediate, unconditional withdrawal of U.S. troops from Southeast Asia. Zinn was unapologetic about this "extreme" position as he articulated his refusal to be confined by the "realistic" proposals set forth by those in power. The book helped to ignite national debate about the war and, as opposition escalated, Zinn turned his attention to philosophical and pragmatic questions surrounding civil disobedience.

Zinn's powerful booklet *Disobedience and Democracy: Nine Fallacies on Law and Order* (1968) laid out a cogent case for what

is now called “diversity of tactics,” which disavows reverence for law, order, and stability, particularly in light of the impoverished political channels for registering opposition to existing policies. According to Zinn, participatory democracy requires citizens who pledge allegiance to human welfare, over immoral rules and conduct, and who hold leaders accountable for their domestic and foreign policy-making. Zinn argued that public agitators, gadflies, whistleblowers, and all those who disrupt business as usual do not violate the spirit of democracy but uphold it.

To this end, Zinn raised consequential questions about the role of the academic in democratic life. In *Politics of History* (1970), he laid out a critique of the ways in which specialized fields impede interdisciplinary engagement with the world, and he eschewed disinterested scholarship. In an unequal world, he argued, exhortations to “value-neutral” knowledge production were not only disingenuous, but a tacit collaboration with power and a betrayal of all those who suffer under the weight of that power. Zinn’s famous tenet that “we publish while others perish” encapsulates his disdain for self-interested professional pursuits over a moral obligation to practice radical citizenship. *Politics of History* exemplifies Zinn’s signature approach to conducting “radical history,” which is to excavate the past for the purpose of inducing and sustaining resistance in the present. Far from sacrificing accuracy, such scholarship holds up an undistorted historical record against “mythological” ideologies that sustain U.S. exceptionalism and the oppressive status quo.

Zinn’s best-selling *A Peoples’ History of the United States: 1492 to Present* (1980), which was nominated for an American Book Award, embodies this “bottom up” research agenda. A chronicle of U.S. history, from the perspective of Native Americans, laborers, women, enslaved peoples, and other oppressed populations, the book overturned conventional narratives of ruling class institutions and heroes as the drivers of social change. Its accessible, conversational style also secured for Zinn a mass audience, and inspired its companion volume, *Voices of a Peoples’ History of the United States* (2004). *Voices* is a collection of revolution-

ary primary documents, and led to spin-offs like *A Young Peoples’ History of the United States* (2007) and the graphic comic-book *A Peoples’ History of American Empire* (2009). In 2008, Zinn and a former student launched the Zinn Education Project, which offers free “people’s history” curricula and teaching materials to middle and high school educators nationwide. Further cementing the book’s widespread influence was the documentary feature film *The People Speak* (2009), narrated by Zinn and featuring theatrical and musical performances by celebrities from Matt Damon to Bruce Springsteen. Live versions of the show continue to be staged in theaters across the country.

Zinn had long recognized the arts as a central vehicle of political analysis and catalyst for action. In *Artists in Times of War* (2000), Zinn described the “transcendent” capacity of artists to rise above establishment discourse and creatively revise peoples’ interpretations of the world as a kind of guerrilla warfare. Zinn was a playwright himself as he treated this genre as another form of radical historiography. Plays like *Emma* (1976) and *Marx in Soho* (1999) sought to resurrect the defiant lives and philosophies of Emma Goldman and Karl Marx for a contemporary audience. This tireless commitment to cross-fertilization between art, scholarship, teaching, and activism was at the core of Zinn’s lifework and mission: history books, teach-ins, classrooms, courthouses, and popular magazines were equally vital and overlapping spaces for advancing unorthodox positions, and growing liberatory movements.

Zinn received many accolades for his intellectual and political contributions, including the Eugene V. Debs Award, the Lannan Nonfiction Literary Award, and the Upton Sinclair Award. But the mark of his extraordinary legacy upon critical political science is to be found in the sheer number of activist-scholar-teachers who have taken up his call: that this “topsy-turvy world” of maldistributed power requires our persistent intervention, exuberant defiance, and stoking of radical hope.

ALIX L. OLSON

References

- Zinn, Howard. 1990 [1970]. *The Politics of History*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Zinn, Howard. 2003 [1980]. *A Peoples' History of the United States*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Zinn, Howard. 2003 [2000]. *Artists in Times of War*. New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Zinn, Howard. 2010. *3 Plays: The Political Theater of Howard Zinn*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Zinn, Howard. 2013 [1967]. *Disobedience and Democracy: Nine Fallacies on Law and Order*. Chicago: Haymarket Press.
- Zinn, Howard. 2013 [1964]. *SNCC: The New Abolitionists*. Chicago: Haymarket Press.
- Zinn, Howard. 2014 [1959]. *The Southern Mystique*. Chicago: Haymarket Press.
- Zinn, Howard, and Anthony Arrove. 2004. *Voices of a Peoples' History*. New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Zinn, Howard, and Rebecca Steffof. 2007. *A Young Peoples' History of the United States*. New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Zinn, Howard, Mike Konopacki, and Paul Buhle. 2008. *A Peoples' History of Empire*. New York: Metropolitan.
- Zinn, Howard, Anthony Arrove, and Chris Moore, directors. *The People Speak*. Dan Abrams, et al., 2009. 1 hr., 46 min., <https://dvd.netflix.com/Movie/The-People-Speak/70118365>.

Index

- AAA *see* Afro-American Association (AAA)
AAUP *see* American Association of University Professors (AAUP)
absolute surplus value 480
absolutism 63, 491
abstract labor 331
Abu-Lughod, Janet 142
academic
 freedom 48, 168, 302, 328, 502, 614
 institutions 47, 137, 278
 labor 168–9, 328
 legitimacy 280
 Marxism 308, 456, 648
 outlets 146, 148, 278
 prejudice 285
academic repression 328–9
 description of 328
 modern problem of 328
 waves of 328
accumulation
 by dispossession 585
 logic of 361
 process 646
 World War Fordist regime of 682
Achilles' heel of Marxism 89
ACORN 669–70
activism
 academic careers with 528
 antifascist 335
 feminist 311
 form and vehicle of 268
 grassroots 200
 history-making 732
 national and international 620
 office 179–80
 political 626, 664, 716
 professional 505
 radical 297
 scholarship and 539
 and sexual violence 543
 social 493
 writings and 522, 543
actually existing socialism (AES) 345, 477
Adcock, Robert 30
Adler, Max 115
administrative bureaucracy 474
administrative means 367
Adorno, Theodor 35, 78, 82, 268, 271, 351, 453, 471–2, 531, 577, 618
AES *see* actually existing socialism (AES)
affluent workers 466
Africa/African
 postcolonial balkanization 645
 “savagery” 343–4
 self-government 644
 Youth Initiative on Climate Change 387
African-Americans 430
 civil rights 303
 consciousness 711
 literary criticism 258
Afro-American Association (AAA) 642
Agamben, Giorgio 157
Agnoli, Johannes 82
Agricultural Adjustment Act in 1938 629
agricultural laborers' revolt of 1830 64
Albo, Greg 318
Alexander-Floyd, Nikol 212
Alexandre Kojève 350
al-Hibri, Azizah 288
alienation
 concept of 330
 description of 330
 as estrangement 330–31
 and objectification 330
 as value-form 331
alienation-reconciliation process 95
Almond, Gabriel 32, 99
alterglobalization 266
Althusser, Louis 78, 94–6, 98, 100–101, 110, 116, 120, 254, 487–8, 592
 conceptual toolbox 707–8
 conjuncture 487
 criticism of PCF 487–8
 materialist philosophy 487
 mental illness 488
AM *see* analytical Marxism (AM)
America/American
 academic system 493
 American Association of University Professors (AUUP) 302
 American Indian Movement (AIM) 347
 American Political Science Association (APSA) 223, 587
 American Sociological Association (ASA) 283
 foreign policy 523
 functionalism 100
 imperialism 723

- institutionalism 559
- liberal democracy 572
- political science 271
- political science and political world 183–4
- power structure 27–8
- American Association of University Professors (AAUP) 48, 168
- American National Election Studies (ANES) 48
- American Political Science Association (APSA) 23, 32, 167, 192
- Amin, Samir 141, 393, 489–90
- analytical Marxism (AM)
 - components 53–4
 - definition of 52–3
 - description of 52
 - Marxist social theory 53–4
 - rational choice Marxism 54–5
 - RCM 54–5
 - relevance of 52
- anarchism 269, 333–4, 482, 541
 - description of 333
 - egalitarian impulse of 334
 - identify with 334
 - seminal articles on 333
- anarcho-socialism 477
- anarchy, principles of 347, 445
- Anderson, Benedict 274
- Anderson, Perry 475, 491–2
 - ideology and beliefs about power 492
 - New Left Review* (NLR) 491
 - writings 491
- ANES *see* American National Election Studies (ANES)
- Anglo-American homogeneity 98, 258, 262, 421, 648
- Anglo/North American tradition 291
- Annenkov, Pavel 57
- antagonisms 72, 80, 193, 351, 640
 - between accumulation 362
 - class 83, 114–15, 475
 - concept of 351
 - de-mediation gestures towards 85
 - fuel 389
 - social 112
 - working class 36
- Anthropocene 208
- anthropocentrism 247
- anthropological monster 374
- Anti-Apartheid Movement in South Africa 397
- anti-behavioral critique, political science 31–3
- anti-capitalist utopias 726
- anti-communism/communist 62, 225, 307, 448, 523, 624, 636
- antifa militancy 336
- antifascism/antifascist 335–6
 - activists 335
 - contraction of 335
 - demonstration 732
 - movement 335
- anti-Franco movement 520
- anti-globalism 700
- anti-immigrant backlash 421
- anti-imperialism 490, 523, 702
- anti-oppression politics 212
- anti-pluralism 21–2
- anti-racialization 469
- anti-semitism 390, 516
- anti-slavery war 58
- antisystemic movements 143, 713
- anti-Vietnam war movement 732
- anxiety 219, 377, 400–401
- Anzaldúa, Gloria 157, 214
- Apodaca, Maria Linda 77
- Apostoldis, Paul 201–2
- APSA *see* American Political Science Association (APSA)
- Apter, David 99
- Arac, Jonathan 255
- Arendt, Hannah 32
- Aristotle 205
- armed conflict group configurations
 - forces/law enforcement 347–8
 - guerrilla armies 348
 - insurrection 348
 - paramilitary or militia organizations 348
 - propaganda by deed 348
 - terrorists 348
- armed forces/law enforcement 348
- armed insurrections 348
- armed propaganda 348
- Armstrong, P. 89
- Arnold, Matthew 247
- Aronowitz, Stanley 65
 - academic work 493
 - critique of scientific inquiry 493
 - political intellectual 494
- Arrighi, Giovanni 141, 393, 410
- art/arts
 - access to 266
 - autonomous 271
 - based intervention 463
 - changing world 267–9
 - description of 266
 - expanding terrain of 266
 - installations and performances 266
 - interpreting world 267
 - power of 269
 - vision, utopia 269
 - work's social context 267
- Ashcraft, Richard E. 44, 495–6, 618
 - political experience 495
 - political philosophy 495–6
 - political theory 495–6
- assimilation 78, 202, 315, 369, 422, 432, 439–40, 667

- Association of American Colleges and Universities 154
 Auerbach, Nina 256, 595
 Austen, Jane 255
 authoritarian/authoritarianism 205, 301, 434, 619
 neoliberalism 116
 political science, Chile 47
 authorship 242–4
 autoethnography 222–5, 531
 autogestion 608
 autonomism 83
 autonomous art 268, 271–2
 autonomy 115–16, 348, 445
 capacity for 229
 human 460
 of migration approach 157
 relative 475
 Axelrod, Menshevik Pavel 485
- Bachelard, Gaston 95
 Bachrach, Peter 21
 Bacon, Francis 460
 Baer, M. A. 46
 Baker, Houston 257
 Bakunin, Michael 433, 478
 Baldwin, James 222, 256
 Balibar, Étienne 157–8
 Baltodano, Marta 709
 Baran, Paul A. 89–90, 296, 498–9, 704
 advancement on Marx 498
 foreign direct investment 499
 global economic system 498
 intellectual influence 498
 monopoly capital school 499
 political and social movements 499
 Baratz, Morton 21
 Barber, Benjamin R. 31, 162, 387, 500–501
 books 500
 political theory 500
 work on civil society 501
 Barker, Lucius J. 193
 Barrera, Mario 78
 Barrow, Clyde W. 25, 152, 328, 367, 502–3
 articles on state theory 502–3
 contributions to organization 503
 Critical University Studies 502
 syndicalist universities 502
 Bartels, Larry 23
 Barthes, Roland 247
 Bartky, Sandra Lee 228
 Bauer, Otto 115
 Bay, Christian 504–5
 new political pedagogy 504–5
 political theory 504–5
 professional activism 505
 pseudopolitics 504
 scholarship 505
 social and political problems 504
 theoretical concepts 504
 war and anti-war experiences 504
 writings 504
 Beck, Ulrich 410
 behavioral/behavioralism 30–32, 49
 critique, political science 30–31
 revolution 33
 revolution, political science 19
 Bell, Daniel 174
 Bell, Derrick 191
 Beltrán, Cristina 200
 Benbow, William 437
 Berg, John C. 383, 507–8
 books 507
 priorities of neoliberalism 507
 radical critique 507
 teaching and scholarship 508
 time as political prisoner 507
 Berkeley rebellion 495
 Bernstein, Eduard 114, 346, 477
 Best, Michael H. 123
 Best, Steven 76
 Biden, Joe 223
 biogenetic capitalism 450–51
 biopower 228
 bioregional communitarianism 207
 Biro, Boubacar 712
 black
 capitalism 304
 feminism 210
 labor 59
 politics 193
 protest music 274
 Black Americans 60, 193, 539, 561
 Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement 218–19, 273, 387, 532, 681, 718
 Black Marxism
 definition of 58–9
 description of 57
 James and Wright 59–60
 race and Marxist thought 57–8
 racial struggle 57
 Black Panther Party (BPP) 347, 433–4
 Black Power movement 257, 430, 433, 711
 BLM movement *see* Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement
 Bloch, Ernst 82, 84
 Block, Fred L. 101, 123, 509–10
 corporate interests 509
 critical political science 509
 doctoral dissertation 509
 extensive realm of political economic discussions 509
 peer-reviewed articles 509
 publications 510
 state-economy relations 509
 structural power of capital 509
 Bloom, Allan 162–3

- body motility 728
- Boggs, Carl 511–12
 - antiwar movement 512
 - books 511
 - discipline of political science 511–12
 - extra-parliamentary left 511
 - New Political Science*, involvement with 512
 - research, writing, speaking, and political work 512
 - Vietnam Day Committee in 1965 511
 - writing for campus newspaper 511
- Boggs, Grace Lee 395
- Bolivia 390, 438, 557, 677–8
- Bolshevik revolution 250
- Bonaparte, Napoleon 418
- Bonefeld, Werner 82, 116
- Bookchin, Murray 514–15
 - desire for liberation 514
 - dialectical naturalism 514
 - social ecology 514–15
- Boot, Max 138
- border
 - critical border studies 157–60
 - globalization 158
 - and migration 157
 - political theory 158
 - “productive” nature 158
- borderlands thinking 78
- borderless world 157
- border regime 159
- Borrego, Carlos 78
- Boryczka, Jocelyn 213, 301
- Bourdieu, P. 152, 239, 374, 406, 551
- bourgeoisie/bourgeois
 - definition of 475
 - ideology 484
 - liberals 402, 484
 - rights 362
- Bourne, Randolph 174
- Bousquet, Marc 168
- Bowles, S. 91
- Bracero Program 79, 421
- Brantlinger, Patrick 254
- Braudel, Fernand 141
- Braverman, Harry 65
- Brendel, Cajo 357
- Bridges, Amy Beth 123
- British
 - imperialism 65
 - Marxist historians 62
- British Suffragette Movement 397
- Bronner, Stephen Eric 516–17
 - academic career 516
 - critiques of anti-Semitism 516
 - intellectual achievement 517
 - political theory 516
 - postmodern deconstructionism 517
 - theoretical turn 516–17
- Brooks, Cleanth 253
- Brooks, Daphne 273
- Brown, M. 314, 472
- Brown, Wendy 228
- Buechler, Steven 217
- Burawoy, Michael 53
- bureaucracy 111, 113, 253, 421, 444, 475, 551, 771
- Burke, Edmund 253
- Burnham, Peter 83
- Burris, Val 28
- business
 - interests 431
 - transactions, routinization of 235
- Business Advisory Council (BAC) 630
- Butler, Judith 412
- Callinicos, Alex 79
- Canada
 - critical political economy in 323
 - dominant class in 323
- capitalism 36, 42–3, 47, 59, 62–5, 70, 90, 95, 137–8, 142, 147, 278–80, 303, 331, 339, 385, 414–15, 444, 450, 456, 466, 474, 489, 491, 556, 564–5, 574
 - analysis of 707
 - to communism 705
 - contradictions of 351, 647
 - crises of 366
 - critique of 351, 530
 - dimensions of 305
 - ecological crisis in 346
 - economic crisis tendencies of 364
 - economic laws of 359
 - economic sub-system 107
 - environmental destructiveness of 278
 - exploiting class under 474
 - framework of 489
 - on global scale 140
 - history of 393–4
 - Marxist-informed critiques of 718–19
 - neoliberal phases of 563
 - origins and development of 549
 - phases of 596
 - polymorphous crises of 475
 - proponents of 311
 - reorganization of 564
 - reproduction of 475
 - social relations under 343
 - strategy for “eroding” 727
 - study of 359
 - systemic critique of 345
 - triumphalism of 75–6
- capital-wage-labor relation 106
- capitalist labor markets 103–4
- capitalist/capital
 - class 313, 337–8
 - commodities 331

- development 484
- economy 441
- exploitation 408, 726
- freedom 42
- and labor-state relations 481
- political-economy 719
- prevail 484
- prosperity 507
- society
 - class structure of 339
 - dynamics of 458
 - social contradictions 351
- state unity and function 98–9
- strikes 359
- systems 364, 366
- world-economy 714
- world-system 44, 393
- capitalist/capital accumulation 305, 360–62, 364, 408, 475, 597
 - description of 410
 - ideology 361
 - requirements of 364
- capitalistic production 566
- captain of finance 235
- captains of industry 234–5
- Cardoso, Fernando Henrique 393
- Carlos, Alfredo 79, 202
- Carmichael, Stokely 429, 711–12
- Carnegie Corporation 47
- Carroll, William K. 127, 682
- Carver, Terrell 518–19
 - critical gender studies 518–19
 - critical political science 519
 - international relations 518
 - political intentions 518
 - theoretical and interpretative engagements 518
- Castles, S. 439
- Cattell, James McKeen 167, 169
- Caucus for a New Political Science (CNPS) 35, 38, 299–302, 529, 684, 686
 - general critiques and engagements of 529
 - organizational development 299
- censorship 271
- Cervantes, Fred A. 78
- chain of equivalence 391
- Chappell, Louise 186
- charity 444–5
- Chase-Dunn, Christopher 142
- Chibber, Vivek 318, 456
- Chicago convention 1967 702
- Chomsky, Avram Noam 174, 522–3
 - books 522
 - contribution to linguistics 522
 - critique of U.S. foreign policy 522
 - initial political writings 522
 - political articles 522
 - reforms and radical changes 522
 - writings and activism 522
- circular migration 439–40
- citational practices 288
- citizen/citizenship 362
 - centered democratic theory 380
 - rights, legal protection of 389
- citizenship 157
- civic engagement 387
- civil
 - disobedience 395, 444
 - rights 387, 568
 - society 112–13, 417
- Claeys, Gregory 261
- Clarke, Simon 101, 116
- class 339–40
 - analysis 377
 - antagonism 83
 - based oppression 210
 - boundaries problem 726–7
 - configurations 446
 - conflict 104, 258
 - conscious 475
 - consciousness 98
 - definition of 339
 - domination 234, 362–3
 - and economic power 243
 - formation 65
 - multidimensionality of 726
 - power 68, 71
 - relations under capitalism 339
 - situation 71
 - stratification 110
 - struggle 57–8, 62, 68, 79, 83–4, 122, 578
 - unequal social relation of 339
- class-party-state 654
- classical conventional social theories 446
- Cleaver, Harry 434, 524–5
 - in Civil Rights Movement 524
 - political economy 524
 - role of cyberspace 524
 - writing and publishing 524
- Cleyre, Voltairine de 395
- climate
 - change 79, 117, 153, 338, 404, 508, 514, 516
 - crisis 117
- Clinton, Bill 670
- Clinton, Hillary 273
- Cloward, Richard A. 65, 464, 527–8, 669–70
 - academic careers with activism 528
 - Civil Rights Movement 528
 - economic dislocations 527
 - social welfare programs 527
 - welfare reform 527
 - welfare rights movement 528
- CLS *see* critical legal studies (CLS)
- CNPS *see* Caucus for a New Political Science (CNPS)
- Cobbett, William 64

- co-creation, creative praxis of 463
- Cohen, G.A. 44, 52, 54
- Cold War, the 47, 62, 90, 98, 137–8, 157
- collective
 - autonomy 348, 445
 - deliberation 331
 - introspection 313–14
 - liberation 348, 444–5
- Collins, Patricia Hill 210–11, 214, 229
- colonial/colonialism/colonization 65, 78, 341–2, 369, 425
 - description of 341
 - difference 392
 - definition of 341
 - expansion 136
 - insofar as 341
 - occupation 448
 - struggle against 446
- color feminism 290
- committed art 247
- commodity/commodities 42, 103, 143, 208, 342–3, 450, 471, 480, 671
 - capitalism 268
 - exchange 471
 - exchange theory 115
 - production 477
- commodity fetishism 343–4
 - definition of 343
 - Marx conception of 343
 - process of 343
- communalism 514, 613
- communication technologies 262
- communism 36, 345–6, 369, 477, 489
 - concept of 345
 - contemporary use of 345
 - council 356–7
 - description of 345
- Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB) 62, 64
- communitarian models 501
- community
 - artists 268
 - development and problem solving 268
 - organizing 268
 - power debate 22
- community armed self-defense
 - framework of 348
 - principles of 348–9
- community self-defense 445
 - armed conflict group configurations *see* armed conflict group configurations
 - concept of 347
 - description of 347–8
 - principles of community armed self-defense 348–9
- conceptual critique of pluralism 21
- conceptual non-identity 351
- conceptualization 36, 38, 183, 397, 471–2, 474–5, 583, 595
- Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities (CONAIE) 667
- Conference of Socialist Economists (CSE) 82–3
- conflicts 290, 398, 414–15
 - antagonistic 606
 - in fiscal realm 374
 - forms of 348
 - between nation states 418
- conjunctural analysis 149
- Connolly, William E. 123, 229, 529–30
- conservative orthodoxy 328
- conspicuous consumption 234
- conspiracy theories 383
- constant capital 408
- constitutional monarchy 112–13
- constitutionalism 115, 163, 353
- consumers
 - capitalism 485
 - debt 377
 - sovereignty 243
- contacts, sources of 431
- contemporary
 - capitalism 159, 283, 661, 708
 - culture 295
 - deliberative democracy 380
 - democratic politics 383
 - discrimination 381
 - late capitalism, definition of 596
 - political/politics 240, 301
 - society, knowledge and culture in 493
- contestation 71, 201, 391–2, 477, 507, 541
- contradiction/contradictory
 - class locations 726
 - concept of 350
 - description of 350–51
 - historical development of 350
 - positive resolution of 351
- Contra war 682
- conventional historiography, postcolonial
 - challenges to 456–7
- Conway, Janet 392
- Coolidge, Calvin 562
- Cooper, Anna Julia 192, 210
- Cooper, Brittany 210
- corporate
 - capitalism 352, 507, 529, 614
 - domination 630
 - giants 354
 - power 68, 71, 354–5
 - structures, organizational logic of 243
 - trustees 328
- corporate liberalism 352–3, 604
 - corporatist ideas in 353
 - corporatist interpretations of 352
 - description of 352–3
 - perception of 352
- corporatization 168
- cosmic feminism 551

- Costa, Mariarosa Dalla 549
- council communism 356–7
 description of 356
 organized 357
 variant of 357
- council-communist movement 356
- Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) 454
- counter-association 299
- Counterintelligence Program (COINTELPRO) 711
- COVID-19 pandemic 128, 146
- Cowen, Deborah 159
- Cox, Robert W. 83, 146–8
- CPERN *see* Critical Political Economy Research Network (CPERN)
- CPGB *see* Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB)
- creative inquiry 462
- credit report 377
- Crenshaw, Kimberle 191–2, 210, 212, 215, 413
- Crenson, Matthew 21
- crime 372
- Crispin, Jessa 175
- critical border studies 157–60
- critical/critics 256–8, 495
 border studies 157–60
 film studies 242–5
 inquiry 462
 materialist analysis 446
 organic catalyst 718
 pedagogy 162–5, 557
 political scientists 266, 478
 pragmatism 555–6
 sociology 281
 thinkers 346
 thinking 242
- critical global studies 152–3
- critical legal studies (CLS) movement
 classroom and community 180
 description of 178–9
 office activism 179–80
 redux 180–81
 scholarship 178–9
- critical media studies
 cultural studies 238–9
 description of 237
 feminist theory 239–40
 Marxism 237
 organizational studies 237–8
 pragmatism 238
 queer theory 240
- critical pedagogy 162–5
 egalitarianism 162
 laws 162
 liberal cosmopolitanism 163
 origins 162
 political science 162
 Socratic Method 164
 student voice 165
- critical political economy 243
 in Canada 323
 coming of age of 150
 conjunctural analysis 149–50
 description of 146
 epistemology and methodology 148–50
 ontological primer 146–8
- Critical Political Economy Research Network (CPERN) 150
- critical political science 338, 377–8, 419, 471, 474
 anti-behavioral 31–3
 behavioral 30–31
 and critical theory 38–9
 definition of 1–2
 discipline against profession 2–3
 ecology and environmental theory 205–8
 and ideology critique 44
 official 3–13
 perspective of 454
 practitioners of 224
- critical race theory (CRT)
 analysing race and racism in political science 193–5
 concepts and unifying ideas 191
 critique of political science 192–3
 description of 191
 methodologies of 191–2
 political science from race, ethnicity, and politics scholars 192–3
 race and racism 193–5
 scholarship 191
- Critical Realism 68
- critical social theory 52
- Critical Sociology* journal 281
 setting stage 281–2
 state of 283
 Summer in America 1968 282–3
- critical systems analysis 107
- critical theory 446, 450, 472, 622
 and critical political science 38–9
 description of 35–6
 practice, and political struggle 36–8
 version of 618
- critical university studies (CUS) 167–70
- critique 147–8
 of intellectuals 172–6
- Crits' scholarship 179
- Cromwell, Oliver 63
- Crowder, George 333
- Crow, Jane 211
- CRT *see* critical race theory (CRT)
- Crusoe, Robinson 248
- CSE *see* Conference of Socialist Economists (CSE)
- cultural/culture
 differentiation 406

- expression, centrality of 720
- of feminist reviewing 290
- hegemony, Gramsci concept of 274
- materialism 720
- politics 618
- of poverty 464, 675
- schizophrenia 78
- sovereignty, importance of 271
- see also* cultural imperialism; popular culture
- cultural imperialism 237, 369–70
 - critiques 369
 - description of 369
 - practice of 369
- cultural studies 237–9
 - perspective of 238–9
 - tradition 239
- cumulative causation 303
- currency-based economics 263–4
- CUS *see* critical university studies (CUS)
- cyclical rhythms 143

- Dahl, Robert A. 19–20, 22, 30–31, 39, 99, 354
- Daley Plaza sculpture in Chicago 267
- Dalton, Mary 256–7
- Darder, Antonia 79, 709
- Darian-Smith, Eve 152, 154
- Darwin, Charles 206
- Davidson, Neil 475
- Davis, Angela Y. 531–2
 - autobiography 531–2
 - career 531
 - intellectual contributions 532
 - monograph 531
 - political science 531
 - public intellectual 531
 - transformative political movements 532
 - writing and activism 532
- Davis, Emmalon 639
- Dawson, Michael C. 194
- Day, Dorothy 580
- de Beauvoir, Simone 412
- de Saussure, Ferdinand 93–4
- de Tracy, Destutt 418
- Debord, Guy-Ernest 333, 534
- debt
 - concept of 374
 - history of 372
 - miscellaneous forms of 372
 - political effects of 372
 - prevalence of 372
 - private 372
- decolonization 157, 439, 448
- DeCoste, Damon 256–7
- de-democratization 529
- Deep Adaptation 208
- Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) 435
- defensiveness 213
- defetishization 344
- dehumanization, degree of 331
- Deleuze, Gilles 139, 333, 529, 535–6, 574
 - assemblage theory 535
 - innovative military strategies 535
 - primacy of identity 535
 - writing histories of philosophy 535
- Delgado, Richard 191
- deliberative democracy 380–81
 - concept of 380
 - macro level 380
 - micro level 380
- Demirovic, Alex 126–7
- democracy* (journal) 285–6
 - downfall of 286
 - failure of 285
 - pages of 286
- democracy/democratic/democratization 113, 162, 304, 572
 - accountability 367
 - with anti-imperialist struggles 718
 - capitalism 660
 - citizenship, effective 381
 - deliberative 380–81
 - depoliticized 362
 - discourses of 529
 - expanding 426
 - forms of 529
 - fundamentals of 391
 - global architecture of 426
 - norms 389–90
 - principles of 385
 - promotion 46
 - representative systems of 387
 - revolution 391
 - symbolism 364
- Democratic National Convention in Chicago 282
- Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee (DSOC) 320
- Democratic Socialists of America (DSA) 320
- demonstrators 292, 397
- Denemark, Robert 142
- Denishoff, R. Serge 273
- dependency theory 393–4, 448
- depoliticized democracy 362
- deprivation 359, 410
- Derrida, Jacques 518
- Desai, Meghnad 88
- Descartes, René 460
- détournement 534
- Deutsch, Karl 99
- Dewey, John 267
- dialectical naturalism 514
- digital
 - capitalism 242
 - democracy 383
 - feminism 133
 - ruling class 337–8
- Dinerstein, Ana C. 82, 84–5

- direct actions 395–6, 444
 - purpose and effectiveness of 396
- disciplinary history 46–9
- disciplinary history, description of 46–9
- discriminatory social status 555
- discursive de-racialization 469
- discursive practices 227
- Disney, Jennifer Leigh 212–13
- disruption, source of 433
- diversity
 - of feminist engagement 295
 - of tactics 395
- diversity of tactics 397–8, 732–3
 - Civil Resistance 398
 - description of 397
 - “Principled” approach 397
 - “Strategic” approaches to 397
- divide and conquer strategy 74
- Djilas, Milovan 173
- Dobb, Maurice 62
- doctoral dissertation 489, 508
- Dolan, Jill 269
- Dolbeare, Kenneth 27
- domestic colonialism 429
- Domhoff, G. William 19, 22, 27–8, 454, 537–8
 - American political science 537
 - candidate-selection process 537
 - contributions to psychology 537
 - critical political science 538
- dominant/domination
 - class 362–3
 - closely-related controversy 400–401
 - concept of 400–401
 - consent and systems of 658
 - educational systems 557
 - forms of 401
 - of immediate physical need 330
 - liberal ideology 507
 - resist authority and 362
 - significant theoretical controversies 400
 - social relationship of 339
 - social significance of 400
 - systems 244
 - traditional definition of 400
- downward redistribution 646
- Draper, Hal 475
- Dreyfus Affair, The 172
- dual power 348, 402, 444
 - political manifestation of class divisions 402
 - Provisional Government 402
- Du Bois, W.E.B. 57–60, 214, 532, 539–40, 681
 - activism 539
 - discipline of political science 539
 - philosophy and politics of 561
 - political thought of 675
 - scholarship 539
 - seminal for contemporary scholarship on “whiteness” 539
 - spiritual strivings 539
 - work for political science 539–40
- Eagleton, Terry 254–5
- Easton, David 19, 30, 32–3, 99–100, 120, 152
- eclectic social movements 516
- eco-anarchism 333
- ecological/ecology
 - criticism 205
 - and environmental theory 205–8
 - Marxism 207
 - political dimension of 566
 - regeneration 618
- economic democracy 385–6
 - description of 385
 - interest in 385
 - work in 385
- economic/economy 115
 - anxiety 219
 - crisis 359–60
 - decision-making 362
 - development 393
 - growth 507
 - inequality 426
 - inputs, administrative distribution of 364
 - insecurity 218
 - institutions 385
 - organization, alternative forms of 385
 - power 354
 - reductionism 249
 - taproot of imperialism 139
 - theories 439
 - values, political allocation of 364–5
- eco-socialists
 - commitment 279
 - perspectives 307
- ecosystem 206, 404–5
- Edelman, Marian Wright 732
- Edelman, Murray 27
- editorial
 - groups, abandonment of 279
 - policy 324
 - practice 295
- egalitarianism 162
- Ehrenberg, John 541
 - active participant in democratic upsurge 541
 - organizational activity 541
- Einstein, Albert 296
- Eisenhower, Dwight D. 225
- Eisenstein, Hester 315
- Eisenstein, Zillah 245, 543
 - activism and writing about the sexual violence 543
 - civil rights movement 543
 - contemporary racism and misogyny 543
 - feminist theory 543
- election campaigns, core dynamics of 431
- electoral politics 79, 186, 272, 274, 478, 718

- electronic networks, to democracy 383
- Eliot, T. S. 253
- Ellison, Ralph 256
- Elster, Jon 44, 54–5
- Emancipation Proclamation 57
- emancipatory/emancipation 35–6, 58–60, 148, 162, 482, 504–5
 - knowledge 154–5
 - social science 726
- emblematic forms 268
- Emmanuel, Arghiri 393, 489
- empire 136–8
- empirical analysis, Marxism 88
- empty signifier 606–7
- Enduring Freedom operation 138
- Engels, Frederick 36, 40, 42, 57, 59, 95, 113–15, 120, 124, 337, 362, 433, 466, 474, 477, 482, 518, 592
- Enloe, Cynthia 545–6
 - analysis of gendered power relations 546
 - Comparative Politics 545
 - feminist approaches 545
 - power relations 545–6
- Enns, Peter K. 23
- enormous economic power 355
- entitlement mentality 365
- environmental/environmentalism 217–18
 - crisis 297
 - discrimination 404
 - form of 278
 - harm 404
- environmental justice 217–18, 404–5
 - description of 404
 - movement 427
- “epic” theory 32
- epistemology 148–50, 290, 535, 588, 595–6
- equality
 - discourses of 529
 - forms of 529
 - principles of 385
- Erlander, Tage 707
- esource mobilization theory 219
- ethical consumerism 344
- ethnic identity, definition of 406
- ethnicity 406–7
 - debates surrounding 406
 - definition of 406
 - description of 406
- ethnography 242, 244, 462, 531
- Eugene V. Debs Award 733
- Eurocentric imperialism 456
- Eurocentrism 341, 356, 490
- European Marxism 491
- Eurozone crisis 150
- Evans, Graham 31
- Evans, Jr., Rowland 648–9
- exceptionalism 213, 247, 616, 636, 733
 - culture 456
- exchange value 343, 450, 471, 480
- exploitation 321
 - concept of 408–9
 - definition of 726
 - Marx theory of 408–9
- Extinction Rebellion 208
- extractive capitalism 507–8
- extractivism 324
- extreme nationalism 262, 389
- false antitheses 555
- Fanon, Frantz 141, 456
- farm interests 629
- Farr, James 30
- fascism/fascist 335, 351, 452–3, 505, 535, 549
 - ideology 335
 - violence 336
- fatalism 235
- Federici, Silvia 412, 549–50
 - anti-Vietnam war movement 549
 - central theoretical contributions 549
 - social movements 549
 - Wages for Housework Campaign (WFH) 549
- Félix, Adrián, 202
- femininity/feminism/feminist 237, 290, 309, 426, 556, 570, 723
 - activism 311
 - analysis 309
 - critique 304
 - epistemology 290
 - forms of 293
 - historical materialism 728
 - international relations research 187–9
 - philosophy 288–9
 - pornography 620
 - promise of 289
 - standpoint 583–4
 - thinkers 388
 - understandings of 288
 - value of 239
- feminist critiques, political science
 - IR research 187–9
 - political behavior and political institutions 186–7
 - political world 183–4
 - raced-gendered hierarchies 184–6
- feminist theory 239–40
 - description of 131
 - local/global 133–4
 - patriarchy 131–2
 - state-centered security 131
 - warriors and fair maidens 132–3
- Ferguson, Kathy E. 551–2
 - feminist approaches 551
 - feminist theory 551
 - political theory 551
 - research interests 551
 - scholarship 551

- Ferguson, Thomas 431
 Fergusson, Niall 138
 Fernandez, Raul A. 77
 feudal fiefdoms 446
 feudalism 62–3, 281, 339, 350, 707
 fictional filmmaking 245
 fictitious rationality 367
 film
 analysis of 242
 critical 242–5
 disciplinary analysis of 244
 practice 245
 thinking about 244
 financial/financialization 410–11
 analysis of 410
 capital 375
 mercantilism 410
 financialisation 91
 Firestone, Shulamith 412
 fiscal crisis 361, 364
 fiscal realm, conflict in 374
 Fluck, Winifred 254
 Foley, Barbara 257
 Ford Foundation 47
 foreign capital 447, 564
 fossil fuels 207, 507
 Foster, John Bellamy 624–5, 647
 Foucault, Michel 227, 229, 333, 460, 462, 529, 553–4
 blindness to sexism 228
 disciplinary power 227–8
 genealogy 228, 553
 Fox Piven, Frances 12, 65, 233, 464, 669, 690
 Frank, Andre Gunder 141–2
 Frankfurt School of Critical Theory 471
 Frantz, Fanon 341, 433, 451, 547–8
 books 547
 Colonial Wars and Mental Disorders 547
 Fraser, Nancy 229, 324, 555–6
 critical pragmatism 556
 justice and critical theory 556
 theory of justice 555
 Frazier, Demita 211
 Freedman, Carl 261
 freedom
 black views of 256
 discourses of 529
 institutional basis for 262
 Freedom House 48
 Freeman, Alan 191
 free market 41
 free spaces 336
 Free Speech Movement (FSM) 614
 free will 218
 free worker 450–51
 Freire, Paulo Reglus Neves 162, 557–8
 advocate for social justice 558
 pedagogic theory 558
 postcolonial theory 558
 unilateralism in teaching 557
 view of education 557
 writing style and sexist language 558
 French Revolution 63, 112–13, 143
 Freud's theory of libidinal repression 626
 Frias, Hugo Chavez 389
 Fridays for the Future 208
 functionalism 99–100
 Futurist movement 1920s 274

 Galarza, Ernesto 79, 710
 Galbraith, John Kenneth 559–60
 agricultural economics 559
 guaranteed minimum income 560
 theoretical intervention 559
 writings 560
 Gans, Herbert 464
 Garcia, John A. 193
 Garcia-Bedolla, Lisa 200
 Garofalo, Reebee 273
 Garratt, James 273
 Garrison, William 210
 Garvey, Jr., Marcus Mosiah 561–2
 evil influence 561–2
 version of black nationalism 561
 Garveyism 561
 gay
 marriage 435
 rights 568
 see also gender
 gender 412–13
 anti-essentialism 412–13
 based oppressions 211
 bias 294
 critical frameworks 412
 identities 413
 inequalities 133
 oppression 728
 politics 545, 692
 power 133
 genealogy 42, 227–30
 description of 227
 practice of 227
 general social theory 493
 general strike 59, 414–15
 description of 414
 types of 414
 workers 414
 General Strike Committee 414
 German/Germanness 274
 fascism 672
 idealism 42, 44
 Gerstenberger, Heide 116
 Giddens, Anthony 410
 gig academy 169
 gig economy 355, 467, 481
 Gilens, Martin 22

- Gill, Stephen 148
 Gillman, J. 89
 Gilroy, Paul 456–7, 469
 Gindin, Sam 71, 563–5, 654
 neoliberal globalization 564
 North American union movement 563
 polarized options 565
 union and workplace struggles 564
 writings 563
 Giroux, Henry 493–4
 Githens, Marianne 183
 “Global Education First” 153
 global/globalization/globalism 152, 157–8, 439, 442, 700
 capitalism 72, 82, 126, 146
 citizenship 153–4
 climate treaties 507
 dimensions of 700–701
 elites 389
 era of 301
 knowledge movement 141
 learning 154
 literacy 154
 neoliberalism 263
 political economy 393
 and postmodern turn 76–7
 ruling class 475–6
 warming 262
 Global Political Economy (GPE) 146
 global studies (GS)
 definition of 152
 denaturalizes the world 153
 description of 152
 educating for global citizenship 153–4
 and emancipatory knowledge production 154–5
 global citizenship, educating for 153–4
 noncritical and critical 152–3
 self-reflection 152
 spatial project of 152
 Global Studies Association (GSA) 155
 glocalization 152
 Glyn, Andrew 89
 Goertz, Gary 213
 “Golden Age” of capitalism 90
 Goldman, Emma 267–9, 478
 Goldman, Lucien 253–4
 Gonzales, Alfonso 201
 Gonzalez, Edith 82
 Gonzalez, G. 77–8
 Gonzalez, Laura 372
 Goonatilake, Susantha 369
 Gordon, Linda 229
 Gorter, Herman 356
 Gorz, André 566–7
 New Left movement 566
 political reflections 566
 Gouldner, Alvin W. 173, 568–9
 “Anti-minotaur” paper 568
 books 568
 sense of crisis in sociology and Western society 568
 governance
 citizen deliberation in 380
 as pragmatism 238
 process 380
 structure 290
 systems of 237
 GPE *see* Global Political Economy (GPE)
 Graeber, D. 442
 Gramsci, Antonio 78, 82, 115–16, 120, 146, 148, 172–3, 218, 239, 267, 274, 305, 416–17, 474–5, 640, 718
 Grant, Judith 570
 analyses of Marx 570
 feminism and Marxism 570
 research specialties 570
 Gray, John 460
 Greenberg, Edward S. 27
 Green movement 686
 Green, Philip 572–3
 academic writing 573
 advocacy of “open borders” 572
 critiques of liberal pluralism 572
 experimental political strategies 573
 ideological thinking 572
 schizoanalysis 573
 Griffin, Lauren 224
 group rights 572
 GS *see* global studies (GS)
 GSA *see* Global Studies Association (GSA)
 Guattari, Félix 535, 574–5
 intellectual contributions to critical political science 574–5
 guerrilla armies 348
 Guha, Ranajit 456
 guild system 452
 Guinier, Lani 191
 Gunnell, John G. 31–2, 285
 Gunn, Richard 82
 Gutierrez, Ramon 76
 Habermas, Jürgen 103, 364, 366–7, 391–2, 576–7
 communicative turn 612
 extraordinary professorship 576
 new social movements 576–7
 normative model of democracy 383
 social movements 577
 writings on the public sphere 576
 habitation 671–2
 Hacker, Jacob 28
 Haddow, Anna 46
 Haiti slaves 60
 Haitian debt 361
 Hall, Stuart 94, 578–9
 contemporary cultural practices 578

- economic ideology 578–9
- Halpern, Cynthia Perwin 285
- Hamilton, Charles V. 429
- Hamm, Bernd 369
- Hancock, Ange-Marie 210, 212–13
- Harding, Sandra 289
- Hardt, Michael 139
- Hardy-Fanta, Carol 200
- Harkness, Margaret 249
- Harrington, Michael 580–82
 - campaigns for civil rights 581
 - Catholic Worker movement, 580
 - criticisms 581
 - political tightrope 580
 - writing style 581
- Harris, Cheryl 191
- Harris, Jerry 155
- Harris-Lacewell, Melissa Victoria 194
- Harrison, John 89
- Hartsock, Nancy 214, 583–4
 - analysis of power and community 583
 - conceptualization of feminist standpoint 583–4
 - ideas on lesbian feminism 583
 - societal relations 583
- Harvey, David 140, 350, 585–6
 - criticisms of 585
 - process of globalization 585
 - theorization of economic crisis 585
 - time-space compression 585
 - urbanism 585
- Hawkesworth, Mary 587–8, 728
 - journal in feminist scholarship 587
 - scholarship 587
- Hegel, G.W.F. 112–13, 146, 214, 350, 441
- Hegelian thinking 96
- Hegelianism 95
- hegemony 416–17, 606
 - concept of 416
 - notion of 417
 - subaltern classes and groups 416
 - theory 218
- Herman, Edward S. 522
- Hertel-Fernandez, Alexander 28
- heteronormativity 228, 240
- heterosexual
 - culture 412–13
 - marriage 435–6
- heterotopias 78
- Higher Education Reconciliation Act 377
- Hilferding, Rudolf 139, 410
- Hill, Christopher 62–3, 65
- Hilton, Rodney 62
- Hirsch, Joachim 116
- Hirsch, Jr., E. D. 253
- Hispanic/Latino politics
 - class, power, and the state 78–80
 - globalization and postmodern turn 76–7
 - liberal pluralism 75–6
 - origin of 74–5
 - radical theories 77–8
- historical Marxism 62–5
- historical materialism 40–41, 43, 248, 253–4, 418–19, 707
 - AM interpretation 53
 - Marxist social theory 52–3
- historiography 58, 62, 199, 202, 242, 456, 604, 733
- Hobbes, Thomas 158, 622
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. 62–5
- Hobson, J.A. 136–7, 139–40
- Hochman, Adam 469–70
- Hofmann, Jeannette 383
- Holloway, John 82, 84
- Honneth, Axel 472
- hooks, bell 215, 590–91
 - devaluation of Black women 590
 - influential contributions 590
 - on political power of community 590
 - theoretical concepts 590
- Hoover, J. Edgar 562
- Horkheimer, Max 35–9, 268, 271, 577, 618
 - pro-communist liberalism of 256
 - pro-communist politics 257
 - radical speech 257–8
- Horn, Kahn-Tineta 324
- Horowitz, David 730
- household debt 377
- Huberman, Leo 296, 704
- human
 - autonomy 460
 - behavior, patterns of 309
 - essence 96
 - nature 461
 - rights 572
 - species, origins and evolution of 730
- Hume, David 40
- Hungarian Revolution 62
- Hunter, Floyd 19–20, 26
- Hunt, Henry 64
- Huntington, Samuel 337
- Hurston, Zora Neale 257–8
- Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy*
 - description of 288
 - history and aims 288–9
 - impact 291
 - scope 289–91
- Ibarra, Armando 79, 202
- idealism 40
- identity, power of 218
- ideology critique
 - components of 42–4
 - critical political science 44
 - as critical political science 44
 - description of 40

- historical materialism 40–41
- modes of thinking 41–2
- working of 41–2
- ideology/ideological 418–19, 595–6
 - Althusserian linkage of 410
 - ambivalence 78
 - description of 418
 - distortions 41
 - hegemony 456, 707
 - history of 418
 - Karl Marx's concept of 418–19
 - of progress 285
 - understanding of 419
 - usage of 418
 - use of 419
- Idle No More (INM) 423
- IDPs *see* internal displaced peoples (IDPs)
- IIPPE *see* International Initiative for Promoting Political Economy (IIPPE)
- IM *see* institutional Marxism (IM)
- imagined community 446
- immanent critique of pluralist theory 19–21
- immigrants/immigration 421–2
 - controls 469
 - description of 421
 - laws 421
 - legal 421
 - restrictions 421
 - statuses 421
 - story of 422
 - unauthorized 421–2
- imperialism 77, 489–90, 499, 624, 673, 718–19
 - benefits of 136
 - description of 136–8
 - and empire 136–8
 - past and present 139–40
 - problems of 489
 - struggle against 446
 - theorizing 138–40
 - see also* cultural imperialism
- income inequality 239, 339
- indentured servitude 169
- independent industrial unionism 432
- indianismo 677
- indigenous human rights 423–4
- indigenous movements 423–4
- indigenous peoples
 - ability of 404–5
 - genocide of 342
- individual rights 347, 572
- individualism 514
- industrial/industrialized
 - capitalism 253–4, 426
 - democracy in Yugoslavia 385
- Industrial Revolution 63–4, 234
- Industrial Workers of the World 437, 444
- inequality 342, 377, 386, 425
 - description of 425
 - dimensions of 425
 - distributive component 425
 - economic 426
 - political 425–6
 - relational component 425
 - social 426–7
- inflation 89, 146, 359, 372, 375, 426
- infopolitainment 271
- information-technology 383
- inherited party bureaucracies 653
- initial despotic states 339
- Innis, Harold 323
- instinctive action 232–3
- Institute for New Economic Thinking (INET) 455
- institutional analysis 70
- institutional change 672
- institutional Marxism 68
 - foundations of 68
 - Marxist state theory 70–72
 - mode of production 68–70
 - political and economic power 70–72
 - relative autonomy 68, 71
 - strengths of 68
- institutional power, the state 99
- institutional racism 429–30
- instrumentalism 28, 120
- instrumentalist theory 120, 634
- Insurgent Sociologist, The* 282–3
- intellectuals
 - critique of 172–6
 - movements 76, 460
- intensity of exploitation 408
- interdisciplinarity 290, 309, 707
- internal colonialism/colonization 74–5, 77, 429–30
- internal colonial model 74–5, 77–8
- internal colonization, Chicano population 74–5
- internal displaced peoples (IDPs) 439
- international
 - Communist movement 356
 - government 262
 - movement 439
 - organizations 361
 - politics 158, 262
 - trade 90, 141, 452
- International Feminist Journal of Politics* (IFJP)
 - description of 293
 - feminist time and space 295
 - geographical footprint 295
 - set of spaces 293–5
- International Initiative for Promoting Political Economy (IIPPE) 150
- international relations (IR) 187–9, 293
- International Reproductive Rights Research Action Group (IRRRAG) 662
- International Revolutionary People's Guerrilla Forces (IRPGF) 348
- interpretive poststructural inquiry 462

- intersectionality
 - description 210, 212
 - description of 210–12
 - integrity of 213
 - plus model 214
 - travel 212–14
 - as traveling standpoint 214–15
- investigative journalism 242
- investment theory of party competition (ITPC)
 - 431–2
 - capital-intensive industries 431
 - historical application of 431
 - international banks 432
 - variations of 432
- involuntary movements 439
- IR *see* international relations (IR)
- Iraqi Freedom operation 138
- Italian workerism 566
- ITPC *see* investment theory of party competition (ITPC)

- Jackson, Jesse 675
- Jacobson, Norman 516
- Jacoby, Russell 174–5, 592–3
 - books 592–3
 - journals 592
- Jagose, Annamarie 240
- James, C.L.R. 57–60
- James, Henry 257
- Jameson, Fredric 78, 595–6
 - literary criticism 595
 - postmodernism 595
- Jayne, Bruno de Oliveira 462–3
- Jessop, Bob 101, 116, 597–8
 - contributions 597
 - strategic-relational approach 597
 - theoretical multifacetedness 597
- Jewish music 274
- Johnson, Claudia 256
- Jones, Sian 406
- journals/journalism 266, 301
 - aesthetics with 247
 - disciplinary boundary 293
 - founders 278
 - political impact 302
- Juergensmeyer, Mark 154
- June insurrection of workers 452

- Kaczmarek, Katarzyna 472
- Kant, Immanuel 139
- Kariel, Henry S. 21
- Kaspar, Eric T. 272
- Katsiaficas, George 600–601
- Katz, Michael 464
- Katznelson, Ira 27, 65, 299
- Kautsky, Karl 114, 478, 484
- Kazin, Alfred 174
- Kellner, Douglas 76
- Kelly, Nathan J. 23
- Kennedy, Duncan 179
- Kesselman, Mark 27
 - books 602
 - journals 602
- Keynes, John Maynard 374, 704, 707
- Keynesianism 83, 499
- Kezar, Adrianna 169
- Khaldun, Ibn 206
- Khondker, Habib Haque 152
- Khmer Rouge 522
- Kidron, M. 90
- Kiernan, Victor 62, 65
- Ki-moon, Ban 153–4
- kin-based world-systems 142
- King, Charles I. 62
- King, Martin Luther 273, 681
- King, Rodney 718
- knowledge economy 597–8
- Kolko, Gabriel 604
 - doctoral dissertation 604
 - domestic and foreign policy 604
 - writings 604
- Kondratieff, Nikolai D. 90
- Konrad, George 173
- Kozak, Marion 317–18
- Kropotkin, Peter 333, 444
- Kuhn, Thomas 30
- Kuznets, Simon 90

- labor 471
 - exploitation 375
 - and management accords 354–5
 - markets 103–4, 310
 - metaphysic 494
 - migration, economic theories of 439
 - movement 438
 - power 104, 331, 408
 - theory of value 480
- Laclau, Ernesto 321, 351, 391, 606–7, 640, 708
 - academic production 606
 - political articulation 607
 - psychoanalysis 606
- Lacombe, Matthew J. 28
- Lafer, Gordon 28
- laissez-faire
 - capitalism 345
 - economy 671–2
- Lal, Deepak 138
- Langan, Mark 449
- Larrazin, Jorge 44
- Lasch, Christopher 286
- Lasswell, Harold 30, 271
- late capitalism 346, 354, 458, 535
- Latin American
 - economies 429
 - industrialization 393
- Latino National Survey (LNS) 199

- Latino politics
 - class, power and state in 78–80
 - description of 74
 - globalization and postmodern turn 76–7
 - Hispanic/Latina/o politics 74–5
 - liberal pluralism and triumphalism of capitalism 75–6
 - radical theories on Latina/o experience 77–8
- Latinx politics
 - description of 199–200
 - gender and grassroots activism 200
 - identity and Latinidad 200–201
 - laboring classes 202–3
 - laboring classes and next left 202–3
 - subaltern 201–2
 - transnational civil society 202
- Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fund 629
- Laurence, Barbara 278
- law and order 482
- Law of the Tendency for the Rate of Profit to Fall (TLTRPF) 89
- Lawrence, Charles 191
- leading by asking 444
- Leavis, F.R. 243
- Lee, Salome 57–8
- Lefebvre, Henri 608–9
 - contributions to urban and spatial theory 608
 - relationship with Situationists 608
 - vision of autogestion 608
 - writing on cities and space 608
- Leff, Enrique 279
- left populism 389
- leftist environmental politics 278
- legal freedom 41–2
- legal immigrants 421
- legitimation/legitimization 361
 - crisis of 362–3
 - sources of 431
- Lenin, V.I. 115–16, 120, 136–7, 139, 250–51, 346, 356, 485, 592
 - analysis of imperialism 484
 - theory of international relations 262
- Leonard, Stephen T. 162
- Leslie, Larry 168
- Levine, Andrew 53
- Levine, Louis 482
- Levi-Strauss, Claude 94
- LGBTQ community 435–6
- LGBTQIA2S+ 134
- liberal/liberation/liberatory
 - bourgeois domesticity 185
 - community 347
 - constitutional order 352
 - cosmopolitanism 163
 - democracy 157, 653
 - democratic states 366
 - economic system 671
 - ethics 349
 - institutions 352
 - mutual aid 444
 - pluralism 75–6
 - progressive policy agendas 718–19
 - psychology 726
 - socialism, form of 514
 - theology, Marxism and 558
- Liberator newspaper 210
- libertarianism 333
- Liebman, Marcel 318
- Lightcap, Tracy L. R. 418
- Lincoln, Abraham 57–9
- Lindblom, Charles 123, 354
- linguistic feminism 551
- Linnaeus, Carl 206
- Liodakis, George 126–7
- literary criticism 247–8
 - autonomous texts and authorial intention 253
 - description of 247, 253
 - Lenin, Trotsky, and classical Marxism 250–51
 - literature and class 253–4
 - literature and women 255–8
 - Marx and Engels 248–9
- literature
 - and race 256–8
 - and women 255–8
- local bourgeoisie 489–90
- Locke, John 460, 622
- logistical spaces 159
- Loken, Meredith 193
- Loomba, Ania 341
- López, Ian Haney 191
- Love, Nancy Sue 610–11
 - awards and fellowships 611
 - political theory 610
 - research on politics and aesthetics 610
- Lowi, Theodore 22
- Lukács, Georg 78, 82, 100, 214, 253–4, 450, 471
 - dialectical method 472
- Luke, Timothy W. 612–13
 - advanced industrial society 612
 - critical political science publications 612
 - digital technologies 612–13
 - political science faculty 612
- lumpenproletariat 433–4
 - black 434
 - concept of 433
 - urban 433
 - view of 433
- Lustig, R. Jeffrey 614–15
 - commitment to political struggle 615
 - critique of corporate liberalism 614
 - freedom and democracy 614
- Luxemburg, Rosa 82, 114, 139, 414, 437–8, 485
- Lyles, Kevin L. 193
- Lynd, Staughton 65
- Lyotard, Francois 247, 460, 616–17

- Macdonald, Bradley J. 323–4, 618–19
- MacKinnon, Catharine A. 309, 450, 620–21
 masculinism and liberalism 620
 national and international activism 620
 scholarly contributions 620
 work on sexual harassment, pornography,
 and sexual violence 620
- Macpherson, C.B. 323, 622–3
 alternative to possessive individualism 623
 books 622
 democratic theory 623
 scientific credibility 623
 style and approach 623
- Magdoff, Harry 296, 624–5, 704
 employment in business 624
 form of imperialism 624
 misconceptions about imperialism 624
- mainstream pluralism 530
- male warriors and fair maidens 132–3
- Mallaby, Sebastian 138
- Mandel, Ernest 90, 123
- Mandel, Michael 410
- Mann, Bonnie 290
- Mannheim, Karl 37, 44, 419
- Marcuse, Herbert 32, 35–6, 82, 531, 600, 618,
 626–7
 contributions to critical theory 626
 critical theory 566
 denazification efforts 626
 in student movement 627
 theory of repressive tolerance 627
 writing 626
- Marglin, Stephen 303–4
- Margolies, Edward 256
- market
 globalism 516
 system 560
- Markovitz, Ruth 730
- marriage 185, 233
 denial of 435
 equality 435–6
- Marti, Edward 709
- Martin, Edward J. 79
- Marx, Karl 35–7, 40–44, 52–3, 55, 57–9, 62, 68,
 71, 88–90, 93–6, 110, 112–14, 116, 120,
 124, 139, 146–8, 159, 172, 214, 218, 225,
 247–9, 281, 337, 350, 359, 362, 408, 433,
 441, 451–3, 458, 464, 466, 474, 480, 482,
 485, 563, 732
 alienation
 concept of 330
 theory of 471, 626
 capital accumulation 489, 498
 commodity fetishism
 conception of 343
 theory of 471
 communism society, capitalism to 263–4
 contemporary relevance of 518
 democratic theory of socialism 477
 dialectical understanding of history and
 relations 583
 exploitation, theory of 408–9
 ideology, concept of 418–19
 notebooks 248
 ossified and orthodox readings of 518
 paradigmatic mode of analysis 707
 political and economic progress 261
 primitive accumulation 342
 proletariat, theory of 466
 theoretical writings 433
 things 330
 vision of communist society 346
 writings of 283
- Marxism-Leninism 115
- Marxist/Marxian/Marxism/Marxists 112–17, 123,
 237, 247–8, 281, 307–8, 333, 364, 456,
 458, 471, 477, 499, 541, 580, 623, 726
 analytical 52–4
 anarchists' critique of 334
 black 57–60
 class theory of time 726
 communism 346
 crisis of 82
 crisis theory 90
 critiques of 412, 553–4
 cultural theory 249
 discourse 720
 economic theory 704–5
 and empirical analysis 88
 historical 62–5
 and liberation theology 558
 objective interpretations of 493
 open 82–5
 political economy 225, 308, 480
 political theory 595
 quantitative 88–91
 rational choice 54–5
 requisites for 121–4
 scholarship 474
 social theory 53–4
 state II 120–24
 structural 82–3, 93–6, 254
 structural-functional 98–101
 systems-analytic 103–7
 traditional interpretations of 524–5
 tradition in world 307
- mass culture 175, 271–2, 636
- mass strike 437–8
 description of 437
 distinctive theory of 437
 theory and practice of 437
 variant of 437
- Massey, Douglas S. 422
- material objects, relations between 343
- Matsuda, Mari 191
- May, Vivian 210

- Mazur, Amy G. 213
 McAlister, Kathryn Morgan 289
 McCall, Leslie 213
 McCarty, Philip C. 152
 McClain, Paula D. 193
 McConnell, Grant 21, 629–30
 McCoy, Charles A. 632–3
 McDonald, Dwight 285
 McDonnell-Douglas Project 511
 McGlen, Nancy 688
 McKay, Adam 245
 McLendon, Michael 167
 McLuhan, Marshall 237, 271
 media institutions
 structure and function of 237
 structure and role of 237–8
 media scholarship 238
 median voter 431
 medievalism 460
 Meijer, Henk Canne 357
 methodism 32
 methodological inhibition 303
 #MeToo movement 218–19, 620
 Mexican Americans 430, 709
 Michels, Robert 25–6
 Michiel, Helen De 463
 microclasses, study of 466
 migration 439–40
 description of 439
 dominant theories of 439
 feminization of 440
 theories of 440
 Miliband, Ralph 22, 27–8, 70, 78, 82, 100–101, 110, 120–23, 317, 474, 634–5
 books 634
 intellectual ferment 634
 militant tactics 335–6
 militarism 718–19
 Mill, John Stuart 572
 Miller, M. J. 439
 Miller, Reuben 222, 224
 Millet, Kate 412
 Mills, Charles W. 638–9
 social contract theorists 638
 social contract tradition 638
 white ignorance 638
 work of 638
 Mills, C. Wright 20, 22, 26–8, 100, 175, 225, 454, 537, 636–7, 713
 intellectuals 636–7
 international movement of university student activists 637
 liberalism 636
 magazines 636
 power relationships 636
 Milton, John 63
 Minerva Initiative 48
 Minter, William 454
 Mises, Ludwig von 337
 Missing and Murdered Indigenous Peoples (MMIP) 423
 Mittler, Ion 392
 mobilization 452
 mode of production 441–2
 moderate conservatives 454
 modern/modernism
 capitalism 142
 democracy 380
 disciplinary power 227
 philosophy 460
 postmodernism vs. 460–61
 world-system 141
 monetarist economic policies 448–9
 Monopoly Capitalism 90
 Montag, Warren 96
Monthly Review (MR)
 description of 296–8
 preeminent focus of 298
 Montreal's 2001 Summit 397
 monumental art 267
 Moore, Joan 430
 Morais, Duarte B. 154
 Morgan, Jana 23
 Morgan, Kathryn 288
 Morris, William 64, 253–4, 618
 Mosca, Gaetano 25
 motivation crisis 364–5
 Mouffe, Chantal 351, 391, 640–41
 multi-dimensional democracy 392
 multifaceted pluralism 530
 Muñoz, Carlos 78
 Murray, Pauli 211
 music/musical
 campaign theme songs 272–3
 closing 274–5
 compositions 274
 description of 271–2
 national, international, and post-national anthems 274
 social movement 273–4
 sounds 272
 mutual aid 444–5
 NAFTA *see* North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA)
 Naples, Nancy 222, 224
 Napoleon III 136
 Nash, Jennifer C. 213
 National Science Foundation (NSF) 47–8
 nation/nationalism 446–7
 nation-state 83–4, 127
 naturalization 41–2
 nature/naturalism 257, 278–80
 Neary, Mike 84
 Negri, Antonio 83, 139, 321, 574
 Nelson, John S. 286

- neoclassical
 - economics 303, 393
 - methods 253
- neo-colonialism 448–9
 - concept of 448
 - formal theory of 448
- neoliberals/neoliberalism/neo-liberalization 305, 311, 456, 467, 480, 491, 578, 597
 - capitalist development 619
 - definition of 585
 - economics and politics of 263
 - globalization 155, 324, 475, 564
 - politics 714
 - umbrella of 500
- network society 521
- New American Movement (NAM) 320
- New Economic Policy in Russia 416
- New Left organizations 387
- new world order 138–9
- New York Federal Reserve 377
- Newnham, Jeffrey 31
- Newton, Francis 65
- Newton, Huey Percy 642–3
 - borderline mentally disabled 642
 - life and experience of 643
- Nietzsche, Friedrich 229, 529, 553, 610
 - critical genealogical approach 229
 - genealogical approach 227
- nihilism 718
- Nkrumah, Kwame 448, 644–5
 - political and intellectual legacy 644
- Nocella II, Antony 328
- noncritical global studies 152–3
- non-feminist critical theory 570
- non-financial corporation 410
- non-political insofar 482
- non-utopian anarchism 333
- North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) 154
- North Atlantic slave trade 57
- Novak, Robert 648–9
- NSF *see* National Science Foundation (NSF)
- Nussbaum, Martha C. 163
- Nyerere, Julius 141
- Obama, Barak 273
- objectification 450–51
 - alienation and 330
 - definition of 450
 - process of 451
- objectivism 224
- Occupy Wall Street 218–19, 266, 329, 387, 541
- O'Connor, James 121, 123, 278–9, 361, 366, 646–7
- Offe, Claus 103–6, 123, 350, 366–7, 458
- office activism 179–80
- Ogden, Anthony C. 154
- Oliván, Manuel Castells 520–21
 - academic and activist communities 521
 - adoption of Marxist lens 521
 - books 520
 - economic and political implications of globalization 520
 - holistic grand narrative 520
 - political and economic systems 520
 - primacy of economic relations 521
 - urban spaces 520
- Ollman, Bertell 648–9
 - Marxism 648
 - political controversy 648
- Olson, Laura Katz 651–2
 - books 651
 - scholarship 651
- Olsson, Göran 245
- OM *see* open Marxism (OM)
- Omi, Michael 469
- One Big Market 671
- open Marxism (OM) 82–5
 - class struggle 83–4
 - core idea 82
 - form analysis 82
 - mediations 84–5
 - nation-states 83
 - subjectivity of labor 84
- open systems 68–9
- openness 294
- opinion, fundamental differences of 356–7
- oppression 321, 396, 409, 504–5
 - fundamental form of 620
 - racial 256
 - structures of 728
- Orbán, Victor 389
- organizational/organization
 - culture 238
 - interventions 431
 - studies 237–8
 - teams 295
- organized council communism 357
- orientalism 137
- orthodox Marxism 114
- orthodoxy 88
- ownership 233
 - centralization and concentration of 242
 - forms of 441
 - marriage 234
- Page, Benjamin I. 22–3, 28
- Paine, Thomas 64
- pamphlet literature 63
- pan-Africanism 644
- Panitch, Leo V. 71, 121, 123, 653–5
 - internationalization of neoliberal state 654
 - Marxist debate on state theory 653
 - political decision-making from parliaments 653
 - working-class politics 653

- Pannekoek, Anton 357
- paradigm shift 257
- paramilitary/militia organizations 348
- Pardo, Mary 200
- Parenti, Michael J. 19–21, 27, 656–7
 - books 657
 - political science textbook 656
- Pareto, Vilfredo 25
- Paris Commune of 1871 482
- parliamentary democracy 721
- parole 94
- Parsons, Talcott 19, 98–100, 120, 175
- participation
 - in antifascist activism 335
 - non-violent forms of 397
- participatory democracy 387–8, 500, 733
 - appeal of 387
 - contemporary theories of 387
 - defenders of 388
 - description of 387
 - supporters of 388
- Pashukanis, Evgeny 82
- pastoralism 286
- Pateman, Carole 658–9
 - liberal notion of the social contract 658
 - liberalism 658
 - teaching career 658
- patriarchy 131–2, 228, 232, 234, 255, 444
- peace, institutional basis for 262
- people-environment relations 278–9
- “Perestroika” movement 33, 38–9
- performativity 247
- periodic elections 389
- Perry, Katie 273
- persistent ignorance 290
- personal biography 222
- Peschek, Joseph G. 28, 454, 660–61
 - books 660
 - politics of empire 660
- Petchesky, Rosalind 662–3
 - research contributions 662
- Peterson, V. Spike 664–5
 - “big” interdisciplinary questions 664–5
 - feminist theory 664
 - practice of political activism 664
 - traditional curriculum 664
- petit bourgeoisie 452–3
 - definition of 452
 - reactionary character of 452–3
- Petras, James 22, 667–8
 - books 667
 - contributions to critical political science 667
 - political commitment 667
- Phillips, Kevin 410
- philosophical
 - analysis 728
 - idealism 418–19
 - pragmatism 559
- Picciotto, Sol 82
- Pierson, Paul 28
- Pinochet regime 47
- Piven, Frances Fox 527, 669–70
 - books 669
 - welfare programs 669
- platform capitalism 383
- Plotke, David 286
- plowshares 395
- pluralism 19, 381, 529
 - conceptual critique 21
 - critique types 21
 - forms of 529
 - immanent critique 19–21
 - within left movements 493
 - mainstream 530
 - multifaceted 530
 - theoretical alternatives to 21–3
- pluralist theory 120
- Polanyi, Karl 141, 671–2
 - centerpiece of 671
 - double movement 509
 - ethical critique of market society 671
 - institutional development for 671–2
 - self-regulating markets 671
- policy
 - analysis, poststructural approaches to 462
 - assemblage 462
 - differences 352
 - elite 454
 - planning network 454–5
 - planning organizations 454–5
 - critical scholarship on 454
 - description of 454
 - planning process 454
- Policy Planning Organizations (PPOs) 537
- polite revolution 205
- political economy 244, 323
 - critical 243
 - of development 410–11
 - journal’s understanding of 324
 - treatment of 297
- political/politics 293
 - action 495
 - activism 626
 - analyses 224, 299
 - antagonism, Schmitt definition of 640
 - authority 366
 - behavior and political institutions 186–7
 - change, movements for 244
 - conflict 374
 - confrontational method of 395
 - connectedness 225
 - contradiction 366
 - critical study of 531
 - criticism 247
 - definition of 271
 - democracy 362, 385, 426

- of difference 728
- ecology 566–7
- economic system 477
- economists 359
- emancipation 281
- engagement, ethical dimensions and cultural bases of 718
- environment 383
- equality 389, 425
- grouping 313
- inaction 21
- inequality 425–6
- institutions 441
- insurgency 464
- legitimation 364
- liability 261
- Marxism 648
- order 496
- parties 437
- power 339–40
- principles 445
- process model 217
- revanchism 397
- scientists 404
- study of 271
- subjectivity 157
- subsystem 103
- of swarming 530
- systems 19, 323
- theory 496, 618
- thought 416
- political science 223, 242, 266, 337, 362, 435
 - American political science 183–4
 - behavior and institutions 186–7
 - Chile 47
 - description of 183
 - feminist critiques of 183–9
 - feminist international relations research 187–9
 - history of 46
 - journals 294
 - NSF funding 47–8
 - production of raced-gendered hierarchies 184–6
 - see also* political/politics
- Pollard, Tom 512
- pollution 404
- Polsby, Nelson 19–20, 22
- Poor People's Campaign 718
- popular art 271
- popular culture 239, 494
- populism/populist 383, 389
 - democracy 389–90
 - model of democracy 725
 - variety of 389
- positivism and post-behavioral revolution 30, 53
 - anti-behavioral critique 31–3
 - behavioral critique 30–31
 - description of 30
- Posner, Richard 175
- possessive individualism 622
- postcolonial/postcolonialism 456–7
 - description of 456
 - porous and amorphous boundaries 456
 - underdevelopment 714
- post-Marxism 458–9
- postie syndrome 76
- postmodernism/postmodernist 76–7, 321, 460
 - ascendancy of 310–11
 - cultural logic of 247
 - definition of 460
 - vs. modernism 460–61
 - theory 456
- poststructural/poststructuralist/poststructuralism 321, 462–3
 - analysis 462
 - anarchism 333
 - approaches to policy analysis 463
 - inquiry 462
 - theory 456
- Poulantzas-Miliband debate 120, 123
- Poulantzas, Nicos 27, 82, 98–101, 110–11, 120–22, 453, 474, 597, 634–5, 673–4
 - intellectual legacy 673
- poverty 218, 359, 429, 464–5
 - description of 464
 - incidence of 464
- power 255, 377, 520
 - of business class 235
 - class-economic 243
 - complexes 242
 - conceive of 553
 - definition 25
 - distributions of 242
 - dynamics 310
 - elite 26–7
 - enactment of 227
 - external deployment of 559
 - hierarchy 26
 - of identity 218
 - indicator 25
 - insights about 228
 - macro analysis of 243
 - micro-mechanisms of 553
 - operation of 227
 - particular games of 229
 - relations 240
 - relationships of 361
 - relative positions of 266
 - to rule society 340
 - sources of 120
 - third dimensional view of 75
- power elite
 - definition 26
 - members 27
- power structure analysis

- American 27–8
- definition 25
- description of 25
- key resources 25
- theoretical traditions 25–7
- understanding American power structure 27–8
- PPE *see* Progress in Political Economy (PPE)
- practical conservatism 713
- practical negativity 84
- pragmatism 237–8
- Prebisch, Raúl 393
- precariat 466–7
- prefiguration, strategy of 268
- prefigurative art 267
- presidential elections 431
- Prigogine, Ilya 141, 143
- primitive accumulation 342, 408, 550
- principle of exclusion 105–6
- private capital accumulation 362
- private debt 372–3
 - description of 372
- private interests 629
- private property 385, 482
- production 331
 - interests of 450
 - means of 362, 482
 - prices of 489
 - primary purpose of 477–8
 - relations of 441
 - social relations of 475
- professional legitimacy 289
- profit maximization, intensified structural
 - emphasis on 410
- progressive activists 267
- progressive cosmopolitanism 516
- Project Vote! 669
- proletarian violence 482
- proletariat 350, 466–7
 - description of 466
 - eras of 466
 - Marx theory of 466
 - subsequent history of 466
- property
 - relations 441
 - types of 441
- prospective employees 329
- protect private property 482
- protest songs 273
- Proudhon, Pierre-Joseph 441
- proximity, gift of 224
- Przeworski, Adam 54–5
- pseudo-democracy 572
- psychogeography 534
- Psychopedis, Kosmas 82
- public art 267
- public debt 374–5
 - description of 374
- public funding 377
- public intellectualism 153
- public opinion polling 380–81
- Pudovkin, Vsevolod 245
- quantitative Marxism
 - categories 88–9
 - crisis and long waves 90–91
 - description of 88
 - and empirical analysis 88
 - finance 91
 - measuring Marxist categories 88–9
 - profit 89–90
- queer theory 237, 240
- Quran, the 205
- racism/race/racial/racialization 75, 191, 210, 228, 315, 406, 422, 427, 464, 578, 718–19
 - academic studies of 469
 - attitudes 429–30
 - based oppressions 211
 - capitalism 202, 404, 464, 681
 - chauvinism 561
 - in commodity fetishism 344
 - concept of 469–70
 - definition of 469–70
 - dual-demand contended 469
 - equality 568
 - gendered hierarchies 184–6
 - identities 413
 - inequality 281
 - injustice 57
 - justice 732
 - literature and 256–8
 - oppression 256–7
 - political mobilisations against 469
 - slavery 57–8
 - utility of 469–70
- radical democracy 402, 641
 - agonistic perspective of 391
 - autonomist–anti-colonial 392
 - definition of 391
 - deliberative strand of 391–2
 - description of 391
- radical/radicalism 732
 - activism, progression of 297
 - democratic movement 391
 - democrats 392
 - hope 733
 - pluralism 529–30
 - sociology 283
 - urbanism 709
 - see also* radical democracy
- rape 185
- rational choice Marxism (RCM)
 - and AM 55
 - definitions 54–5
- rationality

- crisis 364, 366–7
- forms of 367
- Ravenstein, Ernest George 439
- RCM *see* rational choice Marxism (RCM)
- reactionary socialism 477
- Reagan, Ronald 272
- realism 253
- realization crisis 89
- realm of production 408
- Real Utopias program 727
- recognition 472
- red-green framework 279
- redistributive economic policy 304
- Reed, Jr., Adolph L. 675–6
- reification 471–2
 - concept of 471
 - description of 471
 - theory of 472
- reified thinking 472
- Reinaga, Fausto 677–8
 - books and essays 677
 - cultural assimilation 677–8
 - universal public education 677
- relational awareness 152
- relative autonomy 115–16, 475
- relative surplus value 480
- relief policies 464–5
- religious fetish 471
- Rénique, Gerardo 314
- Renner, Karl 115
- Rensenbrink, John 679–80
 - academic career 679–80
 - books on green politics and ecology 679
- representative democracy, critiques of 387
- representative oligarchy 572
- reproductive labor 408
- requisite sense 330
- resource mobilization model 217
- Review of Radical Political Economics* (RRPE) 303–5
 - engagement with political economy 304
 - interdisciplinary nature of 303–4
- revolutionary
 - process 340
 - socialism 618
 - transformation 351
- Rhoades, Gary 168
- Rhodes, Cecil 136
- Ricardo, David 408, 480
- Rich, Adrienne 309–10, 412
- right populism 389
- right-wing militias 347
- right-wing political movements 217
- rituals 233
- Rizzi, Bruno 173
- Robertson, Roland 152
- Robinson, Cedric J. 57–60
- Robinson, Cedric James 475, 681
 - books 681
 - critical platform 681
 - transnationalization thesis 682
- Robinson, William I. 126–8, 152, 682–3
 - transnational capitalist class formation 682
- Rocco, Raymond 201
- Rockefeller Foundation 47
- Rodney, Walter 393
- Roelofs, Howard Mark 684
- Roemer, John E. 52, 54–5, 686–7
 - Philanthropy Project in Minneapolis 686–7
 - research on elite values 686
 - translated Fourier's parody of war 687
- Rosengarten, Frank 314
- Rostow, W.W. 393
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques 42–3, 380, 387
- Rubin, Gayle 412
- Rubin, Isaak 82
- Rudé, George 62–4
- Rühle, Otto 356
- ruling class 474–6
 - concept of 475
 - description of 474
 - intellectuals 41
- Ruskin, John 253–4
- Russell, Bertrand 25
- Russell Sage Foundation 47
- Russian revolutions 390, 402, 416
- Ryerson, Stanley 323
- Sacks, Jean 309
- Said, Edward 369, 456
- sales effort 498–9
- same-sex couples 435
- same-sex marriage 435
- same-sex parenting 134
- Samuel, Raphael 62
- Sanders, Bernie 79
- Santillan, Richard 78–9
- Sapinski, Jean Philippe 127
- SAPs *see* structural adjustment programs (SAPs)
- Sarkees, Meredith Reid 300, 688
- Sartre, Jean-Paul 69
- Saville, John 62, 317
- Schaar, John 31
- Schattle, Hans 153–4
- Scheer, Robert 730
- Schmitt, Carl 640
- Schoenig, Benjamin S. 272
- school of revolution 437
- Schram, Sanford 690
 - books 690
 - empirical research 690
- Schumpeter, Joseph A. 90, 138
- science fiction 261–4
- Science & Society* (S&S) 307–8
 - description of 307

- science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) 134
- scientific socialism 115
- scientific theory 254
- scientificity 707
- scientism, pretenses of 310
- Scott, James C. 63
- Seawright, Jason 23, 28
- secular trends 143
- Sedghi, Hamideh 692
 - books 692
 - internal contingencies 692
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky 412
- seedbed of virtue 435
- seigneurialism 63
- selective statism 509–10
- self-actualization 450–51
- self-defense 347–8
- self-governance 348, 482
 - mechanisms of 423
- selfhood, Freudian and Lacanian models of 573
- self-reflection 152
- self-scrutiny 291
- seminal thinkers, hermeneutical assessments of 516
- Serrano, Andres 267
- settler colonialism 404
- sex/sexism 210, 228, 435
 - see also* gender
- sexual exchange, terms and conditions of 310
- Shaikh, A. 88
- shareholder value 410
- Shoup, Laurence H. 454
- Shulman, George 286
- shuttle diplomacy 713
- Signs* 309–11
 - articles in 310
 - contributions to political studies 309
 - contributors 310
 - editors 310
 - interdisciplinary feminist epistemic community 309
 - scholars publishing 309
 - traditional journals 311
- Sim, Stuart 458
- Sina, Ibn 206
- Sinclair, Upton 167, 170
- Singer, J. David 694–5
 - academic career 694
 - academics 694
 - COW project 694–5
- Singh, Jakeet 392
- Situationist Movement 534
- Skinner, Quentin 496, 696
- Sklair, Leslie 475
- Sklar, Martin J. 352, 604
- Skocpol, Theda 70, 101
- Slaughter, Sheila 168
- slaveowners 339
- slave/slavery 339, 408
 - narratives 257
 - oppression and exploitation of 339
 - racialized 57–8
 - trade 63
- Small, Christopher 272
- Smears, Bessie 256–7
- Smith, Adam 304, 408, 480
- Smith, Barbara 211
- Smith, Beverly 211
- Smith, Gavin 63
- Smith, Rogers 225
- smooth democratic unfreedom 626
- Snyder-Hall, Claire 699
 - feminism 698
 - Marxism and critical theory 698
 - political theory 698
 - professional advocacy 699
 - social movements and community-building 698
 - teaching and research 698
- social justice 607, 728
 - challenge accounts of 728
 - organizations 335
- social movements 220, 349, 359
 - analysis 217–20
 - music 273–4
 - society 217
- social relations 267, 550
 - under capitalism 343
- Social Science Research Council (SSRC) 47
- social/socialist
 - activism 493
 - being 69–70
 - capital, optimal expenditures on 366
 - change 232, 323
 - cohesion 84, 99
 - connectivity model 728
 - consciousness 69–70
 - death 401
 - democracy 720
 - eco-civilization 279
 - ecology 207
 - egalitarian movements 427
 - equilibrium 374
 - formation 441
 - inequalities 62, 74, 426–7
 - injustice 258
 - learning 44
 - life 40, 147
 - logic 360
 - media 134, 238, 383
 - movements 313
 - ontology 595–6
 - policy 104
 - practices, Althusserian linkage of 410
 - prejudices 249

- ramifications 377
- reproduction 412
- responsibility 154
- schism 337
- science 243, 407
- stratification 110
- welfare programs 385
- social structures of accumulation (SSA) theory
 - 91, 304
 - research program 305
- social theory 308
 - cultural expression and communication to 720
 - Eurocentric and traditional approaches to 600
- socialism 278–80, 352, 466, 477–8, 491, 516, 565, 581, 618, 673, 707, 727
 - democratic theory of 477
 - description of 477
 - Marxian conception of 477
 - models of 721
 - proponent of 622
 - visions of 608
- Socialism and Democracy* (S&D) 313–16
 - contribution to racism 315
 - critical approach 313
 - description of 313
 - distinctive feature of 314, 316
 - publication of 314
 - special issues 314
- Socialist Register* 317
 - editorial history 317–18
 - other editions and histories 319
- Socialist Review*, description of 320
- socialization
 - processes of 412
 - subsystem 103, 364
- societal identity 446
- society 385
 - authoritarian and hierarchical modes of organizing 395
 - class structure of 54
 - without opposition 626
- Society for Women in Philosophy (SWIP) 288
- sociological imagination 224
- sociology
 - anthologies 730–31
 - definition of 282
 - objectivity in 568
- Sociology Liberation Movement 282
- Socratic Method, critical pedagogy 164
- solidarity not charity 444
- songs 272
 - protest 273
- SORO *see* Special Operations Research Office (SORO)
- sovereign power 281
- Soviet filmmakers 245
- Soviet Union, collapse of 138
- spaces of flows 520
- Spanish feudalism 77
- Special Operations Research Office (SORO) 48
- species being 330
- Spinoza, Baruch 139
- SSA *see* social structures of accumulation (SSA)
- school
- SSRC *see* Social Science Research Council (SSRC)
- Stalinism 62, 64
- Star Trek
 - fictional history 262
 - optimism 262
 - optimistic insofar 264
 - signature feature of 263
 - world government in 261
 - world government inherent in 262
- state
 - apparatus 111
 - (relative) autonomy 115–16
 - black box notion of 131
 - characteristic of 110
 - and civil society 112
 - contemporary capitalism 110–11
 - definition 110, 121–2
 - elites, political interests of 482
 - feminist theory and 131–4
 - legitimacy 110, 362
 - managers 475
 - Marx's writings on 112–14
 - as objective structures 120
 - power 339–40
 - repressive function of 122–3
 - social policy 104
 - sovereignty 110
 - strategic-relational approach 116
 - as superstructure 114–15
 - theory, strategic-relational approach 597
- state power 68, 71, 79, 85, 122
- state theory, twenty-first century 116–17
- statism 727
- Steger, Manfred 700–701
 - global studies 700–701
 - scholarly contributions 700
 - transition from nationality to globality 700
- Steinbeck, John 732
- STEM *see* science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM)
- Stephens-Dougan, LaFleur 194
- Stern, Sol 730
- Stewart, Maria 210
- Stimpson, Catharine 309
- Stojanovic, Svetozar 474
- Stone, Katherine 180
- Stone, Lawrence 63
- Storing, Herbert 31
- strain-deprivation model 217
- strategic logics 727

Strategies: A Journal of Theory, Culture, and Politics 321–2

Strauss, Leo 32, 164, 724

structural adjustment programs (SAPs) 155

structural-functional Marxism

contemporary 99–100

description of 98

legacy of 100–101

legacy of Marxist structural-functionalism 100–101

Poulantzas and contemporary

structural-functionalism 99–100

unity and function, capitalist state 98–9

structural Marxism 82–3, 93–6

continued importance of 96

description of 93

early Marx and late Marx 95–6

structuralism 93–5

continued importance of 96

structural/structuralism 28, 120

causality 95–6, 116

continued importance of 96

inequality 728

injustices 728

la langue 93–4

linguistic signs 93

Marxism 94–5

parole 94

super-determinism 100

structuralist abstractionism 101

student debt 377–8

accretion 377

anxiety of 377

description of 377

peonage 377

Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) 580

Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) 493

Studies in Political Economy: A Socialist Review 323–4

subaltern Latinx politics 201–2

subjectivity/subjectivization 228, 574

limits constitutive of 229

substantive rationality 367

substantive reasons 367

suffering, dimension of 718

sui generis 64

supremacy 342

Surkin, Marvin 21–2, 702–3

articles 702

CNPS 703

Dodge Revolutionary Union Movement (DRUM) 703

political program 702

political science 702

surplus

expropriation 442

food 425

labor time 408

value 374, 480–81

surveillance capitalism 337–8, 451

Sutcliffe, B. 89

Sweezy, Paul M. 20, 89–90, 120, 296, 498–9, 704–5

on China's economic development strategy 705

on economic stagnation 704

editorial leadership of 499

Office of Strategic Services (OSS) 704

pricing behavior of oligopolistic firms 704

studies of 704

views on economic stagnation 704

syndicalism 482–3

description of 482

origins of 482

syndicalist society 482

systems analysis

contradiction 103

critique of political science 107

decision-making 120

mainstream 107

political subsystem 103

socialization subsystem 103

systems-analytic Marxism 103

contradictions of welfare state 104–7

methodology 103

systemic power and labor market 103–4

systems analysis as critique of political science 107

welfare state, contradictions of 104–7

Szeleni, Ivan 173

Tabb, William K. 624

tacit political knowledge 724

tactics/tactical

employment of 397

repertoire 414

Tate, Katherine 193

TCC *see* transnational capitalist class (TCC)

terrorists 348

Thatcherism 578

them vs. us dichotomy 76

theoreticism 149

theory of emergence 69

theory of internal colonialism 75

Therborn, Göran 707–8

Althusserian concepts 707

books 707

interdisciplinary approach 707

journal 707

status of “scientificity” 707

thesis-antithesis-synthesis 350

Third Worldism of the Non-Aligned Movement 448

Thomason, Jacqueline M. 291

Thompson, Dorothy 62, 65

- Thompson, Edward Palmer 62, 64–5, 69–70, 318
 Thorstein Veblen's critical social theory 232–5
 Tillmon, Johnnie 528
 time-space compression 585
 TLTRPF *see* Law of the Tendency for the Rate of Profit to Fall (TLTRPF)
 TNS *see* transnational network state (TNS)
 Toloudis, Nicholas 602
 Tonak, E.A. 88
 Torr, Dona 62
 Torres, Rodolfo D. 79, 202, 709–10
 application of class analysis 709
 Chicano Studies programs 709
 critical commitment 709
 emancipatory aspiration 709–10
 Ethnic Studies programs 709
 public and academic impact 709
 race-relations problem 709
 Touraine, Alain 520
 trade
 agreements 448
 unions 278, 437
 traditional liberal capitalism 385
 traditional theory 35–9
 traditional working class 466–7
 transformation problem 89
 transition debate 63
 transnational capitalist class (TCC) 126–7, 475
 transnational civil society 202
 transnational migration 439–40
 transnational network state (TNS)
 critics of 127–8
 definition 126
 function 126
 theory to empirical research 128
 transnational practices 682
 transnational state
 critics of 127–8
 description of 126–7
 from theory to empirical research 128
 transportation 262, 480
 Tronti, Mario 83
 Trotsky, Leon 250–51, 452–3
 Truman, David B. 30
 Trump, Donald 272–3, 661, 676
 Truth, Sojourner 210
 Tse-Tung, Mao 346
 Ture, Kwame 711–12
 Black Power movement 711
 Democratic National Convention 711
 public and white national media 711
 reclamation of Black humanity 711
 Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) 711–12
 Turino, Thomas 274
 ultraimperialism 682
 unauthorized immigration 421–2
 underdevelopment 489
 unemployment benefits 223
 ungovernability 362
 Union for Radical Political Economics (URPE) 282, 303
 Unitarian Liberal Religion 726
 United Gold Coast Convention (UGCC) 644
 United Nations Development Program 440
 Universal Basic Income plans 364
 universalization 41–3
 universities 328–9
 urban-rural movements 439
 use-value 343
 U.S. health care system 651–2
 utopia/utopian
 fiction 261
 performatives 269
 of socialist revolution 727
 Valle, Victor 709
 value
 free neutrality 588
 free science 148
 neutrality 36
 neutral knowledge production 733
 self-valorization of 331
 vanguard 484–5
 description of 484
 notion of 484
 political agency 484–5
 variable capital 331, 408
 Veblen, Thorstein Bunde 232–5
 analysis of instinctive behavior 232–3
 evolutionary scheme 234
 evolutionary theory 232
 historical development of ownership 233–4
 human social evolution 235
 instinctive action 232–3
 institution of “ownership-marriage” 232–3
 social evolution 233
 vector autoregression (VAR) 88
 Vela, Alfonso García, 82
 Verba, Sidney 99
 verisimilitude 222
 violence
 feminist theorizations of 311
 intensification of 335
 types of 347
 Voegelin, Eric 32
 Voluntary Simplicity 208
 von Humboldt, Alexander 206
 voting, transparent approach to 383
 Waddell, Brian 28
 wage-good production 481
 wage labor 62, 342, 475, 482
 wage slavery 57
 Wagner, Helmut 357

- Walker, Alice 258
- Wallerstein, Immanuel 141, 393, 713–14
 civic culture 713
 development and modernization theory 713
 research emphasis 713
 world federalism 713
 world-systems analysis 713–14
- Wallis, Victor 716–17
 New American Movement 716
 New Political Science 716
 new social movement 717
 political activism 716
 writing of 716
- Walzer, Michael 42
- war on slavery 58
- Ward, Colin 333
- Warner, Michael 412
- Washington Consensus 449
- Washington, Mary Helen 258
- Wasko, Janet 242
- Watkins, Gloria Jean 590–91
- wealth, social distribution of 385
- Weber, Max 71, 110, 122, 271, 339, 374
 sociology of feudalism 730
- Weinstein, James 320, 604
 ideological position 320
- Weisskopf, T.E. 89–90
- Weldon, S. Laurel 213
- Wengrow, D. 442
- West, Cornel R. 718–19
 books, essays, and articles 718
 publications 718
- West European capitalism 491
- Western imperialism, critique of 318
- Western Marxism 146
- white ignorance 638
- Williams, Jeffrey J. 167–9
- Williams, Patricia 191
- Williams, Raymond 720–21
 British New Left 720
 concept of democracy 721
 critical political science 720
 identity politics 720
 studies of English culture 720
- Williams, William Appleman 604, 722–3
 on American Revolution 722
 American-Russian Relations, 1781–1947 722
 Cold War propagandistic narratives 722
 The Contours of American History 722
 Empire as a Way of Life 722
 historian of U.S. foreign policy 722
 The Tragedy of American Diplomacy 722
- Wilson, William Julius 675
- Winant, Howard 469
- Winkler, Stephanie Christine 472
- Winters, Jeffrey 22
- Wisconsin labor protests 218–19
- Witko, Christopher 23
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig 247
- Wolfe, Alan 21–2
- Wolfenstein, Eugene Victor 495
- Wolff, Jonathan 58
- Wolin, Sheldon 31–2, 164, 285, 495–6, 610, 724–5
 articles 724–5
 North American Political Theory 725
 political commentary 724
 Political Theory as a Vocation 724
 Politics and Vision 724
 student movements at Berkeley 724
 writings on democracy 725
- women
 employment 311
 equality 687
 literature and 255–8
 movements 728
 reproductive labor 549
 rights 387, 568
 see also gender
- women-of-color feminisms 290
- womenomics 311
- Women's Caucus for Political Science 688
- Wood, Ellen Meiksins 44, 65, 76
- Wood, Neal 62
- working classes 564
- working-class organizations 564
- workplace democracy 385
- work/workers 563
 insecurity 219
 middle-class politics of 467
- world citizenship 163
- world-economies 142
- world-empires 142
- World Social Forum (WSF) 155
- world-systems analysis (WSA) 141–3, 713
 core powers support 142–3
 cultural studies 143
 cyclical rhythms 143
 description 141
 evolutionary world-systems 142
 kin-based world-systems 142
 secular trends 143
 semiperiphery 142
 world-economies 142
 world-empires 142
 world system history 142
- World War I 136, 138
- World War II 46, 48, 137, 282, 307
- Wright, Erik Olin 52–4, 726–7
 Analytical Marxism group 727
 Comparative Class Analysis Project 726
 formal aesthetic mastery 258
 naturalism 257
 Real Utopias Project 726
 social engagement 726
 social transformation 727

- surveys of class structure 726–7
- Wright, Richard 57–60, 256–7
- WSA *see* world-systems analysis (WSA)
- WSF *see* World Social Forum (WSF)
- Wylie, Alison 289–90, 310

- Xenos, Nicholas 285

- Yelvington, Kevin A. 406
- Young, Iris Marion 728–9
- Yugoslavia, industrial democracy in 385
- Yuval-Davis, Nira 213

- Zapatistas 154–5
- Zeitlin, Maurice 730–31
 - edited books 730
 - peer-reviewed articles 731
- Zimmermann, Patricia R. 463
- Zinn, Howard 732–3
 - critical political science 732
 - “history-making” activism 732
 - lifework and mission 733
 - political analysis 733
- Zvobgo, Kelebogile 193

